

Handwritten
J. A. Nichols
c. 1

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OFThe Author.....

AM.1930

ni
c.1

June 1930

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

THESIS

Intellectual Evolution of Henrik Ibsen as a Dramatist.

Submitted by

Ruth Ann Nichols
(B. S. in P. A. L. 1929)

In partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts.

1930

44517

378.744

BO

A.M. 1930

ni

e-l

"In reality my development is thoroughly
consecutive. I myself can indicate the
various threads in the whole course of my
development, the unity of my ideas, to their
gradual development....."

Henrik Ibsen to Lorentz Dietrichson.



[Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]



THE INTELLECTUAL EVOLUTION OF HENRIK IBSEN AS A DRAMATIST.

INTRODUCTION

A. The Problem.

CHAPTER ONE

I. A Short Biography of his life.

1. Ancestry.
2. Early life.
3. Education and early works.
4. Training he received for his profession through:
 - (a) Study of books.
 - (b) Study of Human Nature.
 - (c) Management of Theatre.
5. Marriage and private life.
6. Death.

CHAPTER TWO

II. His Philosophy as revealed through his plays.

A. His strong belief in:

1. Wholesome discipline of sorrow.
2. Educative power of suffering.

CHAPTER ONE

1. The Problem

CHAPTER TWO

1. The Scope and Purpose of the Study

2. Literature Review

3. Methodology

4. Data Collection and Analysis

5. Results and Discussion

6. Conclusion

7. References

8. Appendix

9. Bibliography

10. Index

CHAPTER THREE

1. The Scope and Purpose of the Study

2. Literature Review

3. Methodology

4. Data Collection and Analysis

B. His Morbidity.

1. His disinterestedness in life's pleasures.
2. His fascination for sadness and tragedy.
3. His aloofness from the world.

C. Ibsen's attitude toward his Fellowmen.

1. His distaste for clergymen.
2. His dislike of lawyers.
3. His critical attitude toward teachers and scholars.
4. His liking for physicians.

CHAPTER THREE

III. The First Period of His Development.

A. Crude, untechnical melodramas; but withal showing the radical Ibsen in the embryo, so to speak.

B. Eight plays of His First Period: The Romantic Period.

1. Lady Inger of Ostrat. (1857).
2. The Feast of Solhaug. (1856).
3. The Vikings at Helgeland. (1862).
4. The Pretenders. (1864).
5. Brand. (1866).
6. Peer Gynt. (1867).
7. Emperor and Galilean. (1873).

C. Critical Evaluation of this First or Romantic Period.

1. His "Introduction".

2. His "Introduction" to the "Introduction".

3. His "Introduction" to the "Introduction".

4. His "Introduction" to the "Introduction".

5. His "Introduction" to the "Introduction".

6. His "Introduction" to the "Introduction".

7. His "Introduction" to the "Introduction".

8. His "Introduction" to the "Introduction".

CONTENTS

1. The first part of the "Introduction".

2. The second part of the "Introduction".

3. The third part of the "Introduction".

4. The fourth part of the "Introduction".

5. The fifth part of the "Introduction".

6. The sixth part of the "Introduction".

7. The seventh part of the "Introduction".

8. The eighth part of the "Introduction".

9. The ninth part of the "Introduction".

10. The tenth part of the "Introduction".

11. The eleventh part of the "Introduction".

12. The twelfth part of the "Introduction".

13. The thirteenth part of the "Introduction".

CHAPTER FOUR

IV. The Second Period of His Development.

A. Shows great progress in dramatic art. His second period is controversial, and he wages open war with local hypocrisy.

B. The Six Plays of His Second Period:

The Realistic Period.

1. The League of Youth. (1869).
2. The Pillars of Society. (1877).
3. A Doll's House. (1879).
4. Ghosts. (1881).
5. Enemy of People. (1882).
6. The Wild Duck. (1884).

C. Critical Evaluation of this Second or Realistic Period.

CHAPTER FIVE

V. The Third and Last Period of His Development.

A. This last stage reveals Ibsen as the perfect artist and completes his splendidly progressive career.

B. Seven Plays of His Third and Last Period of His Development:

The Mystical Period:

1. Rosmersholm. (1880).
2. The Lady of the Sea. (1888).

CHAPTER VIII

1. The first part of the chapter.

2. The second part of the chapter.

3. The third part of the chapter.

4. The fourth part of the chapter.

5. The fifth part of the chapter.

6. The sixth part of the chapter.

7. The seventh part of the chapter.

8. The eighth part of the chapter.

9. The ninth part of the chapter.

10. The tenth part of the chapter.

11. The eleventh part of the chapter.

12. The twelfth part of the chapter.

13. The thirteenth part of the chapter.

CHAPTER IX

1. The first part of the chapter.

2. The second part of the chapter.

3. The third part of the chapter.

4. The fourth part of the chapter.

5. The fifth part of the chapter.

6. The sixth part of the chapter.

7. The seventh part of the chapter.

8. The eighth part of the chapter.

3. Hedda Gabler. (1890).
4. The Master-BUILDER. (1892).
5. Little Eyolf. (1894).
6. John Gabriel Borkman. (1896).
7. When We Dead Awake. (1900).

C. Critical Evaluation of this Third and Last or Mystical Period.

CHAPTER SIX

Summary.

1. Name of the person.

2. Date of birth.

3. Place of birth.

4. Name of the father.

5. Name of the mother.

6. Address of the person.

7. Signature.

8. Date.

9. Place.

INTRODUCTION

A score of years ago Henrik Ibsen was the universal subject of embittered contests and arguments. He did not seem to be able to enter the gates; he was "outside the pale", so to speak. Why? Merely because America has a democratic way of looking at all things through the childish eyes of the majority. It is very significant to recall at this moment my own present-day view of censorship as revealed by this "Strange Interlude" controversy. The attitude of the censors toward this play is similar to the attitude of the people of Ibsen's period to his plays. No one knows exactly what he is quibbling about; but it appears pretty evident that someone who calls himself the "intelligentsia" has dubbed "Strange Interlude" immoral and the intellectual proletariat has risen with one great cry of "Follow the Leader." So it was when Henrik Ibsen was trying to break through a maze of objections. When a man tried to live his own life, and break away from the old conventional attitudes, he was cast out of his climate as one sick with the dread disease of Ibsenism. To be called "Ibsenite" was a most fearful insult, for Henrik Ibsen was at that time the radical of radicals.

But Ibsen was not to be subdued by any ignorant attacks upon his writings. He kept to himself, and steadfastly stuck to his belief that genius is born from solitude. Wherever

he went, he was quiet and had little to say; but all the time his mind was in a state of continual evolution. He had a terrible moral earnestness that swept away silly conventions. He was swayed by such words as Truth, Justice and Liberty. Show him a scene of injustice and he will take his pen and write about it. Show him a lie, and he will proceed to point out that the lie will grow from a tiny root into a tree of falsehoods. Tell him that a man is bound by the fetters of stern duty, and he will scoff at you in the words of Hilda in *The Master Builder*:-

"Duty! Duty! Duty! What a short, sharp, stinging word.¹"

This idea of Ibsen's straightforwardness is exemplified in his play *"Enemy of the People"*, through the character of Dr. Stockmann. Dr. Stockmann finds out that the reputed health resort is nothing but a place of disease, and he does not hesitate to declare the truth, although he knows that the truth will cost him his position. This illustration exactly portrays Ibsen. He sees wrong, and he tries to right it..... a thankless task.

People are content to hold the Panglossian view; they see no need of change, and when Ibsen dared to wreck their conventions he was met with bitter scorn. These people were

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer Vol. 10,
Page 215.

so completely submerged in their own world of hoity-toity ignorance that they glanced askance at Ibsen's precociousness and were shocked at such "immorality."

But it was not "immorality"; these people merely used that word to shroud their own delinquencies. Henrik Ibsen was far from "immoral"; he had not an obscene idea in his head. He wrote problem-plays. He discussed two sides of a question and left the audience to make a reasonable judgment. Ibsen had no use for cheap boudoir talk; he wanted action. His plays were written primarily for thinkers,-for men who can see beyond the "ashes of their fathers, and the temples of their Gods."

Some one has called Ibsen a pessimist. This is fallacious, for Ibsen does not hold a dogmatic theory that the world is wrong, and can never be righted, rather his eternal cry is-"right the wrong." He states the condition of things and asks the people to repair them.

If you know the final scene of "Ghosts" you can recall how very sordid it was with Helen Alving leaning over her son and going through the mental struggle of 'to murder or not to murder'. But, withal its pessimism, there was a splendid motif running as an undercurrent to that scene. "The sins of the father are visited upon the

children." The theme of the play is true, is it not? Then why should Ibsen be called immoral and pessimistic because he happened to have the mental faculties that enabled him to subtly teach a lesson while giving entertainment? The great Ibsen had a duty to perform in this world; he, from early youth, had the desire to become famous-but he desired to be worthy of that fame. He refused to stagnate in the silent waters of his forefathers, and his eternal cry was for others to be as progressive.

In concluding this introduction I might add that Ibsen has constructed in the course of his years a relentless citadel that is guarded by cornerstones called Truth, Liberty and Love. His advancement has been nothing short of miraculous. His intellect has developed with a logical precision which is unique among dramatists. The distance between his starting-point and his present-day status is great, and the intermediate stage can hardly be passed over slightly.

Ibsen has had three great periods of development and during each development his mind underwent a change----hence, as new views opened on him, he rejected his old ideas.

undoubtedly. The theme of the play is love, is it not?
Love of a kind which he calls 'love' and 'passion'
but he has no response to love, the woman's passion that
inspired him to write, that a woman's love
inspired him. The great lesson that a man to perform
the love and; he, from early youth, had the feeling of
passion, because he was not to be without that love.
He refused to respond to the woman's love at his
fortieth year, and his second act was for them to be
as he was.
It is something like this, I think, that I want to tell
them and especially in the course of his life a
woman's love, that is, the love of a woman's
kind, which, I think, is love. The woman's love
has nothing about it of the love. The woman's love
developed with a kind of freedom which is not
any freedom. The woman's love is not
noting and the woman's love is not, and the
woman's love can be passed over without
it. It is not that kind of love, but it is
and the love is not, and the love is not
because, as we have seen, as we have seen, as we have seen,
rejected his old ideas.

The important fact in this evolution is this:-
Ibsen's changes were always for the best----his outlook
grew broader from stage to stage, until finally he
reached the criterion of perfection which marks him as
a dramatist today.

The remarkable development of Ibsen has not been
merely a succession of advancements; but rather I might
say it has been an everlasting and unbroken climb to the
summit.

CHAPTER ONE

Henrik Ibsen's ancestry is mingled with a foreign strain, German, Scotch, German, and again German. Jaeger¹ says that not a drop of Norwegian blood, had, by direct descent, any part in the composition of Henrik Ibsen's temperament, which nevertheless has been styled "peculiarly Norwegian."

Probably this mingled ancestry will help us to explain his isolation, and thus we can account for his complete detachment from his native land. His Scotch ancestors may have given him his puritanical and straightforward attitude toward life while his German forefathers may have been the cause of his individuality and his fondness for constructive day-dreaming, so to speak.

One of the most important features in speaking of his ancestors is that Ibsen most probably derived all his intellectual peculiarities from the female side of the house. His grandmother is known to have been, for her time, an extraordinarily well educated woman. She was renowned for her gravity and taciturnity. Ibsen's

1. Life of Henrik Ibsen: Henrik Jaeger. Page 2.

James' theory of the universe is a simple one. It is based on the fact that the universe is made of matter and energy. Matter is the stuff of which the universe is made, and energy is the force which makes it move. Matter and energy are the two basic elements of the universe, and they are inseparable. Matter cannot exist without energy, and energy cannot exist without matter. They are two sides of the same coin, and they are always found together. James' theory is a simple one, but it is a very powerful one. It explains the universe in a way that is easy to understand, and it is based on facts that are easy to observe. It is a theory that is both simple and powerful, and it is a theory that is worth considering.

One of the most important features of James' theory is the fact that it is based on the fact that the universe is made of matter and energy. This is a very important fact, and it is one that is often overlooked. Many people think of the universe as being made of matter alone, but James shows us that it is made of both matter and energy. This is a very important discovery, and it is one that has changed our understanding of the universe. James' theory is a simple one, but it is a very powerful one. It explains the universe in a way that is easy to understand, and it is based on facts that are easy to observe. It is a theory that is both simple and powerful, and it is a theory that is worth considering.

mother was also peculiarly reticent, and people found her generally uncommunicative. In direct contrast her husband was a convivial soul who was always ready for a jest and was much beloved by his neighbors for his generous hospitality. It is no wonder then that Ibsen's nature was more or less contradictory, for it was divided against itself at his birth. His father was merry; his mother was sad---how then could poor Ibsen possibly find a "mean between," to use Aristotle's phrase?

2. HIS EARLY LIFE

Henrik Ibsen was born at Skien, March 20, 1828, the oldest child of his parents. It might be pertinent to notice here that Ibsen and Tolstoy were born the same year, but that Ibsen never even heard of him. This will give us an idea of just how much of an exile Henrik Ibsen was.

Skien was a little town on the southeast coast of Norway; a typical home of all the Philistines, and it was correspondingly full of childish minds and little mean pretensions. One can easily see the influence of such a town upon the broad mind of Ibsen, and wonder not

at his antagonistic attitude toward it in later years. Such a town as Skien blooms too often in this world, and not as often does it have a genius in its midst who can deride its smallness, and try, through subtle allusions, to right the wrong therein. How many of us live in a Skien, and are choked to death between the narrow walk of its false conventionalities? Henrik Ibsen left this deadly atmosphere at the age of sixteen ----perceiving even at that tender age the havoc that "small-town" ideas may cause in the lives of the inhabitants, finally snuffing out their lives with its deadly poison.

Until Henrik Ibsen reached the age of eight, he was reared in the affluence of a patrician household. But suddenly his father became destitute, and from that time forward until he was middle-aged Ibsen did not get away from the clutch of a wretched, grinding poverty. His life was a continual struggle against adversity; many times he was forced to go without sufficient clothing, and often did he suffer from the grim shadow of starvation. Yet withal he plunged on and on, never for a moment slackening his pace or taking a rest until he reached his goal. Embittered by these hard years of servitude, how could he have escaped acquiring an attitude of sombreness toward life and his

fellowmen?

His childhood was colored by a drab dismalness which took away any childish exuberance that might have been his. Some of the things that influenced Ibsen's mind when he was but a child are of a most ghastly nature. For instance, the rigid laws of the solemn church, the horrors of the prison, the threat of the pillory and the terrors of the madhouse all managed to make an impression which cast a shadow over his youthful lightheartedness and infused in him a precocious gravity.¹

Ibsen really never had what one calls child-life. He did not play like other children, rather his one ambition was to keep away from them and not be bothered by their heedless intrusions. It is a safe assumption that Ibsen did a great deal of thinking during these childhood isolations, and that he managed to become acquainted with a certain type of literature which urged him on to constructive thinking. Also, during his strange adolescence, he became absorbed in painting, and craved to be sent to an art school. His ambition was, of course, not realizable due to his poverty; but the stick-to-itiveness in Ibsen's makeup permitted him to work diligently with pencil and brush

1. Life of Henrik Ibsen: Henrik Jaeger. Page 13.

until he worked out the whimsical idea of painting figures on cardboard, cutting them out and attaching them to little blocks of wood so they could stand. Then he would sit for hours composing them into various groups to convey the idea that an important event was being discussed. This simple pastime was the first indication of stagecraft in the future dramatist and then he was only at the immature age of fifteen.¹

When Ibsen was sixteen he was sent to an apothecary at Grimstad in order to learn the business, and he left Skien without any qualms; in fact he never returned there again save a few short visits. And why should he? What had his native town afforded him in cultural lines? Nothing, only a mass of dead conventions, scenes that told of grim tragedies, and poverty that had made him realize the power of money over the power of righteousness,-these were his souvenirs from the town of Skien.

He remained six years in Grimstad, a town that equalled Skien in its dead-aliveness. In the preface to "Catiline" we learn what Ibsen's life was in the community. But, although Grimstad was a sad period for Ibsen, he nevertheless made the best of the situation. He studied human nature and watched the amusing antics of the townfolk. He stole hours for study, and began to write poetry. It was here that Ibsen

first began to study human beings and made the decision that books were not half as convincing as people themselves. Probably this is the reason why he remained peculiarly "unbookish," a singular attitude in a man of letters.

3. EDUCATION AND EARLY WORKS

Ibsen became interested in medicine and started the arduous task of preparing himself for entrance examinations to the university. While studying Latin he read Cicero and Sallust, and it is to these two readings that Ibsen owes his first creative effort--the tragedy of "Catiline". I will speak sparingly of this drama; it is almost unworthy of Ibsen's name, being more of a trial-sheet than a complete play. "Catiline" is but a political treatment in the form of a historical drama, and it shows Ibsen's feelings at that period. Ibsen was determined to make a name for himself, and after doing so, he was perfectly content to die. "Catiline" as a whole, might be the hysterical ravings of a clever madman.

We find in this play the two feminine characters, Aurelia and Furia, who are the germ of the two leading types of heroine that Ibsen in his later works immortalizes: Aurelia is the representation of gentle love, which sacrifices

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

It is a very common mistake to suppose that the

only way to get a good result is to work hard.

all in her utter devotion, and Furia represents the Hjórdís type; the designing female who would cast away the world to obtain her desire, and who would kill her beloved rather than lose him. In Furia and Hjórdís, a later character, we see a great similarity, and this similarity is endless in its progress, for Ibsen has always in his plays a relentless, selfish woman.

It is not to be wondered that "Catiline" is in many respects a crude production. What is more a wonder is that it contains so much of the later Ibsen and overshadows the trend of the poet's maturer period. One feels that this play is weak, and that the author himself realizes its weaknesses. At this period Ibsen was scarcely what one terms "educated"; he could hardly aspire to a remarkable career in letters without a course in the classics which was the ornamental feather wherewith any crow-soul might parade undiscovered among the peacocks of culture.¹

"Catiline" was not received by the public. Only thirty copies of it ever found customers; the remains of the edition were disposed of to a huckster, and "Catiline" became mere shreds of paper. But the indomitable Henrik kept relentlessly on his way!

A second "infant-play" called "The Warrior's Tomb" was performed at the Christiania Theatre. It dealt with tender

1. Commentary on the Writings of Henrik Ibsen: H. H. Boyesen.

romance and did attract some notoriety for the author. Ibsen then followed this by "St. John's Night", a play that was full of fairy lore and truly never amounted to much in helping Ibsen to climb the ladder of the skilled play-wright. A more significant piece of work was "Norma", or a "Politician's Love" which scourged Norwegian politics and displayed in the germ some of Ibsen's later ideas concerning community politics. This play was never published in book-form.

From this point Ibsen made a rapid progress, for in the year of 1857 he wrote "Lady Inger of Ostrat", a tragedy that really claims a place on his list of plays and is the father of his later dramas. We will hear more of this play later; it is sufficient here to remark that Ibsen is entirely himself. He studied no books; he copied no special forms of writing; he was startlingly eccentric in his individual views, even as a youth, and yet, unprepared as he was, he, today, holds an esteemed place in the world of belles-lettres.

4. TRAINING HE RECEIVED FOR HIS PROFESSION THROUGH THE (a) STUDY OF BOOKS

Ibsen was in no sense of the word a student. He was a youth who was full of the zest of living, and

genuinely interested in human beings. The Revolution that set Europe in a turmoil acted as a spark to young Ibsen's restless spirit, and he enthusiastically gave his support to those who sought their freedom by way of verse-writing. These verses caused comment in the community of Grimstad, and brought him disgrace and social extinction. But the young and undeveloped genius only twisted his sword the more grippingly in the side of the provincial town, and determined to air his personal views at any cost. How pertinent is Ibsen's attitude in this minor affair, and how clearly it brings home the idea that "the child is father of the man!" Just picture this greenhorn apothecary-apprentice daring to speak aloud of things which the philistia hardly mumbled of even in the privacy of their kitchens. Is this not a premature glimpse of Ibsen----the man----who holds such a scornful attitude toward those who call themselves pillars of society?

(b) STUDY OF HUMAN NATURE

In the month of March, (1850) Ibsen arrived at Christiania to complete his studies which would enable him to enter the university. This period appears to be the only one where he did go through a definite "study-period," for here he entered a school kept by Heltberg, a man who prepared students for the university. Ibsen did not pass his examinations; but one cannot stress too much the fact that he profited much by Heltberg's teachings and that it probably gave him another chance to study human nature, and that of a much different variety from Skien or Grimstad!

(c) MANAGER OF THEATRE

Ibsen was a year and a half in Christiania and he was still a poor man with no evident prospects of bettering his financial conditions, though he labored endlessly in every conceivable form of literary work. But the power of will was in him; he would not take failure, and in November, 1851, he was appointed stage-manager of the Bergen Theatre.

There is no question that this position was the first solid stepping stone of Ibsen's stairway to fame.

(1) *THEORY OF THE*

In the course of the investigation, it was found that the results of the experiments were in general in agreement with the theoretical predictions. The only exception was in the case of the experiments on the effect of the temperature on the rate of reaction, where the results were in disagreement with the theoretical predictions. This was due to the fact that the rate of reaction was found to be independent of the temperature, whereas the theoretical predictions were that it should be proportional to the temperature. This was due to the fact that the reaction was of the zero order, and the rate of reaction was determined by the concentration of the reactants, and not by the temperature.

(2) *THEORY OF THE*

The results of the experiments on the effect of the temperature on the rate of reaction were in disagreement with the theoretical predictions. This was due to the fact that the reaction was of the zero order, and the rate of reaction was determined by the concentration of the reactants, and not by the temperature. The results of the experiments on the effect of the concentration of the reactants on the rate of reaction were in agreement with the theoretical predictions. This was due to the fact that the reaction was of the zero order, and the rate of reaction was determined by the concentration of the reactants, and not by the temperature.

It gave him ample opportunity to study dramatic technique, and we all know that skill is derived from experience. The dramatist who has been a stage-manager has stored up for himself a great deal of knowledge. For instance, Ibsen learned during this stage how to tell whether a play will "go over" or "fall flat", to use stage vernacular; he learned that the audience is very important in determining the future success of the play being performed; he learned that a little twist in a scene will make the drama successful, or on the other hand, cause its failure. Thus we can not forget for one moment the importance of the fact that Ibsen became so intimately connected with the stage; but for this association he might never have acquired that mastery of dramatic technique which is so greatly admired in his plays.¹

5. MARRIAGE AND PRIVATE LIFE

Ibsen married the daughter of the well known authoress, Magdalene Thorensen. We might think that Ibsen's chance for a happily wedded life would be thwarted by his passionate quest for individuality and liberty. Everywhere we hear of his eccentricities. We know from

1. Life of Henrik Ibsen: Jaeger. Page 69.

"Love's Comedy," that he is wary of love-matches, and we recall his "Doll's House" with a knowing wag of the head; Nora and Torvald, seemingly the happy couple, lived together for years only to arrive at the frightful conclusion that they were ill-mated. These dramas, along with various others, would prove that Ibsen held a cynical view toward matrimony; it is true that he did, but nevertheless Henrik Ibsen married Susannah Duae Thorensen, and stayed married to her---and according to biographers¹, never had a desire to leave her.

Obviously Susannah Ibsen (née Thorensen) was a wonderful woman, for there is no doubt that the genius must have been very exacting, and not only did she bear with his bluntnesses and edges of his character; but she learned to make him happy, and stranger still, to be happy herself in the security of his captured affection.²

Henrik Ibsen and his wife lived in harmony for a full half of a century, and although he wrote satires on marriage, yet he himself bore his bondage with an agreeable acquiescence, never once attempting to break the link.

It might be well here to give a miniature description of Henrik Ibsen. He was a man of small stature, but

1. Life of Henrik Ibsen: Jaeger. Page 98.

2. Life of Henrik Ibsen: Jaeger. Page 88.

nevertheless he was a man of striking appearance. His forehead was impressively high and his hair was white to the point of snowiness. Ibsen's face was a clear mirror through which the man's inner soul was revealed; his lips were generally in one straight, compressed line. Jaeger¹ said that Ibsen's whole countenance gave the look of having just come to some determination. His whole frame emanated power, and in regard to his physical condition it has been said he was never ill.

The reason for Ibsen's fine health was probably his strict adherence to regulations. He made habits of working and rarely changed them, even to suit his own convenience.

Jaeger² tells us:

"He rises at seven in summer, in winter a little later. He takes a very long time to dress, for he has acquired the habit of walking to and fro and thinking out his compositions while performing his toilet, which occupies him alone an hour and a half. He then takes a light breakfast and as the clock strikes nine he sits down to work. He stops work at one, and takes a walk before his midday meal. In the afternoon he reads, takes a light supper, and goes early to bed."

1. Life of Henrik Ibsen: Jaeger. Page 244

2. Life of Henrik Ibsen: Jaeger. Page 245

With these facts in mind, is it not easy to understand the methodical workings of his mind and see why his plays all carry that definite air of "going toward a goal?" Ibsen himself knew what he wanted; he wasted no moments palavering with time. His life worked as regularly as some great clock, and it ticked away with a steady momentum that was magnificent in its equilibrium.

6. HIS DEATH

The young Ibsen was grave, silent and taciturn, so it is only natural that with increasing years his reserve should increase into a still deeper state of taciturnity. He talked very little, and was especially silent in crowds. Ibsen resembled the old time monks in that he was not quite at ease unless he was poring over books, or shuffling papers about his desk in preparation for work.

Ibsen's last days were passed in the Norwegian capital. These days brought him the gratification of every imaginable luxury. He was wealthy; he was famous as the world's recognized chief play-wright; he had distinctions, and he was in every sense of the word, a celebrity. But let us not forget his early struggle against adversity; let us remember him when he went without food, without clothing, and without friends, and let us ponder upon the remarkable transition

that took place between 1850 and 1900. Ibsen was a first handed example of the self-made man.

He died in May 23, 1906, at the age of seventy-nine years. The last six years of his life were darkly clouded by tragic fate; he was doomed to the curse of enforced inactivity, and his splendid mind, which had stirred the country to so much controversy by its unique individuality, now took on the form of a crumbling structure, worn and decayed by overuse---Henrik Ibsen, the perfect artist---was, at his death, mentally infirm.

that case, I was between 1900 and 1905. I was not a
first hand witness of the case, but
we did in 1905, 1906, at the age of twenty-
five years. The last one, when at his age twenty
floated up the river, he was bound to the shore of
the river, and his father, who had
returned the property to the bank, was not
individually, nor even on the date of a meeting
between, with and to whom of course, Henry
the father, and the son, in the case, was not

CHAPTER TWO

THE PHILOSOPHY OF IBSEN AS REVEALED THROUGH
HIS WORK

On looking back over Ibsen's early life we come to the conclusion that he was gratified in taking such a cynical stand against the world. He suffered cruelly from injustice, and he found very few friends whom he could call 'true.' It is no wonder, then, that his works reveal a philosophy of life which is far from cheerful.

Boyesen¹ remarked that he got the impression through reading his works that Ibsen was born old. This early maturity may have been due to the cramped circumstances of his childhood; for we cannot forget that it was such ghastly places as the pillory, the jail, and the mad-house which fascinated him during the psychological impressionistic age.

Ibsen never indulged in pastimes. He was a stickler for duty-first, and his shy nature would have kept him from participating in youthful games even had he so desired. His shyness developed into stern reserve, and he walked alone, content with his own company.

1. The Writings of Henrik Ibsen: Boyesen. Page 49.

There is an apparent contradiction in Ibsen's admiration of despotism and his desire to abolish the state with all its restraining agencies. He loves despotism, however, not as an ultimate condition, but as an indispensable transitional stage in the education of the races. His despotism is part of what is the only positive content of his philosophy; for example, the wholesome discipline of sorrow and the educative power of suffering. There is scarcely a single one of his maturer plays in which this lesson is not more or less directly enforced.¹

(1) THE WHOLESOME DISCIPLINE OF SORROW

The wholesome discipline of sorrow is one of Ibsen's pet theories. He loves to make an individual suffer the torments of the damned and this idea is brought out in "Lady Inger of Ostrat" when she realizes that her illicit love affair is to be discovered by the world, and also in the case of her daughter, Eline, who finds out that Nils Lykke was her sister's betrayer, after she had sold her soul to him for a few false endearments. Each character of Ibsen's is doomed to suffer; this crucifixion of characters at times goes to an extreme; always in the foreground of his dramas there is some individual being hurled through space

1. The writings of Henrik Ibsen: Boyesen. Page 12.

by the power of convention and crying out in anguish for someone to save him from complete destruction.

(2) EDUCATIVE POWER OF SUFFERING

His second pet theory is the educative power of suffering! This is more of an optimistic philosophy, for here Ibsen tries to tell his audience that the man who can come through bitter anguish is always the better for his struggle. He infers that suffering is a sickness which purges the body of sediment and allows the stricken one to rise from his bed a better and wiser individual for the illness. Take Consul Bernick as an example of this idea; he is one of the pillars of society, and he was accepted in his community as a worthy and respected dignitary. But he was not; he was everything that a man should not have been. And when he realized that his iniquities were to become town-gossip, he trembled with apprehension. He suffered agony upon agony as he felt himself submerged under an accumulation of evidence which would soon ostracize him from his people. But what did Ibsen do? He subtly changed Bernick from a bumptious villain into a weeping hero, for without hesitation Bernick unveils his past to the people and does not spare the details. Thus Bernick has, through the pain of suffering, become

educated; he no longer tries to shield his wickedness, but strives to cleanse himself of his sins by way of confession. According to Ibsen, suffering or a guilty conscience is one of the most educative powers upon this earth.

B. HIS MORBIDNESS

Henrik Ibsen was probably one of the most morbid of men. He dwelt upon tragedy; his own life was so filled with sadness, that he could only believe others met with the same disillusion.

At an early age he acquired that serious gaze which sees but the death's head at the banquet of life; he refused to be cajoled into complaisance by such transitory pleasures as music, flowers and parties. Whenever he did deign to go to a gathering, he stood more or less apart from the crowd, so that they might easily feel that he was sneering at their levity and high spirits. He was the type of man whose wine was spoiled by the drop of gall in the goblet, and he would cast his glass away contemptuously.

Ibsen despised small-talk and avoided it much as he would a rattlesnake. For him there was no greater sin than indulging in a conversation that meant the besmirching of someone's character. He remained silent, and there were times when he would not even smile, although people about him might

admitted; he is honest with his friends and associates, but
 always to himself at the time of his own confession.
 according to him, collected of a native confession is the
 of the most effective means of this kind.

B. THE REFORMATION

Henry Jones was probably one of the most honest
 of men. He was a man of great integrity; his own life was as plain
 with honesty. He was a man of great integrity; his own life was as plain
 the very distinction of

At an early age he was noted for his various good
 acts and the people's heart at the height of his; he was
 to be noted for his various good acts and the height of his; he was
 as much as his own and honest. He was a man of great integrity; his own life was as plain
 is a gathering, he was a man of great integrity; his own life was as plain
 so that they might really feel that he was a man of great integrity; his own life was as plain
 every day with honesty. He was a man of great integrity; his own life was as plain
 was noted by the people of his in the people, and he would
 give his life for his country.

These honest men of his life and virtues is much as he
 would a better man. For his life was as plain as his own and honest.

There is a reformation that is the best of the reformation of
 honesty and honesty. He was a man of great integrity; his own life was as plain
 that he would not even admit of a reformation that is the best of the reformation of

be making hilarious laughter at some remark they dubbed "funny."

Henrik Ibsen had a most weird attachment for tragedy and sadness. Jaeger¹ says that if Ibsen ever attended a ball he was certain that he (Ibsen) would stand aside meditating on all the sorrow and misfortune which lurked in the background beneath the cheerful surface, and he would wonder how many of the dancers were waltzing only to forget their woes. Ibsen always found a particular charm in dwelling on tragic images. He seemed to sum up life's constituents in three phrases: to long, to hope, and to be disappointed.

He feels that fate is always turning her wheel against the god of fortune, and that no sooner does fortune fall at your feet when wily fate comes along and whisks it away, placing in its stead a mass of cold, dead sea-fruit.

He considers life as a gay pageant in which we find no pleasure. Ibsen is in ill humor with humanity and the plan of creation, and he spends his time trying to show what a paltry, contemptible lot men are and how aimless, futile, and irrational is their existence on this earth, with its chaotic strivings and bewildered

1. Life of Henrik Ibsen: Jaeger. Page 54.

at which the other members of the committee were present.

"Thank you."

Thereafter, the committee held a series of meetings for the purpose

of considering the various matters which were referred to it.

and it was decided that the committee should continue its work

until such time as it should be able to report to the board.

In the meantime, the committee has been very busy in its work

and it is hoped that it will be able to report to the board

at an early date.

There is nothing more to report at this time.

I am, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,

Wm. H. H. H.

The following is a list of the members of the committee:

Chairman: Mr. H. H. H.

Members: Mr. A. B. C., Mr. D. E. F., Mr. G. H. I., Mr. J. K. L., Mr. M. N. O., Mr. P. Q. R., Mr. S. T. U., Mr. V. W. X., Mr. Y. Z. A.

and others.

The committee is very much indebted to the board for the

privilege of being able to report to the board.

and the board is very much indebted to the committee for the

work which it has done.

The committee is very much indebted to the board for the

privilege of being able to report to the board.

endeavors¹. To him tragedy is the breath of life, and sadness is the machine that fans this breath.

Ibsen's whole life was completely estranged from human intercourse. Whether Ibsen believed himself mentally superior to his fellow-mates, or whether his seeming austerity was due to his shy, reticent nature is hard to determine. From the study of his works and his life, I arrive at the conclusion that the latter cause most probably erected the barrier between the world and the great dramatist. As we have seen, his youth was unhappy; he saw unfairness, injustice and cruelty run rampant through the by-roads of life and he suffered terribly from an emotional reaction to these indignities.

His own fellowmen turned against him, as we know, and this fact hurt Ibsen very much; he drew himself closer and closer in that shell of reticence that was to mark his later years. No matter at what angle we may look at him, we can see that there is the stuff of true tragedy in Ibsen's life. He ran against obstacles; he met with disappointment after disappointment; he saw intrigue and political machinations covet the property of the righteous; he faced desolate days and hungry nights. Is it any wonder then, that he kept himself aloof from the world, that he remained a stern and solitary pilgrim, a looker-on, but

1. Writings of Ibsen: Boyesen. Page 49.

never a partaker in the life of his age?¹

One might wonder if his hardened-heart would have softened if he went out among the pure country fields,- and breathing in the fresh air, purged his body of morbid poisons. If he had gone where he would have seen only clean love, heard children's laughter and been kissed by faithful lips would he have found the "joy of life", would he have reconciled himself to the world, and instead of calling people "creatures", would not he have blessed them with the name of "God's children?" It is too late to tell, now---but the psychologists never forget to tell us that "environment" rates a high percentage in making or breaking a person---and Ibsen's environment was the most unfortunate of all unfortunate environments.

1. Writings of Henrik Ibsen: Boyesen. Page 50.

C. IBSEN'S ATTITUDE TOWARD HIS FELLOWMEN

Of course, Henrik Ibsen had chosen friends, friends he kept throughout his life. But withal he had an inner dislike for certain types of men and this dislike cropped out in his dramas. He handled his antagonistic attitude toward them deftly---but nevertheless he leaves his black mark ever-present against them. Take for instance, "Ghosts"; here Ibsen simply gives us the most revolting idea of a clergyman in the character of Pastor Manders. He is painted as a weak, namby-pamby sort of fool who commits the greatest follies under the name of religion. Ibsen also strikes at clergymen in his "Wild Duck.."

There is no doubt in regard to Ibsen's dislike for lawyers. A pertinent example is found in the character of Brock, a middle-aged, aristocratic libertine and epicurean viveur who plays the part of Hedda Gabler's silver lining in her matrimonial sky. Brock is the revolting type of man who has the prudence to cover up his tracks and the discretion to avoid scandal. I say revolting because he presents himself a figure of holiness to the community---hiding his rotten self under the armour of righteousness. Brock could have been in any kind of business; but Ibsen takes special pleasure in making him a "lawyer."

THE JEWELRY BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES

It is a well known fact that the jewelry business in the United States is one of the most important and profitable of any. The industry is estimated to be worth over \$1,000,000,000 annually. The jewelry business is a highly competitive industry, and the success of a jeweler depends upon many factors, including the quality of the goods, the skill of the craftsman, and the location of the store. The jewelry business is also a highly seasonal industry, with the majority of sales occurring during the holiday season. The jewelry business is a highly competitive industry, and the success of a jeweler depends upon many factors, including the quality of the goods, the skill of the craftsman, and the location of the store. The jewelry business is also a highly seasonal industry, with the majority of sales occurring during the holiday season.

Any reader acquainted with "Doll's House" remembers Torvald Helmer, that handsome, good-natured but utterly colorless individual who is the spirit of selfishness, and Ibsen makes him a lawyer; he seems to delight in making the profession the buffet of his innuendoes. Mr. Krogstad---also in this play---is depicted as a disreputable lawyer who blackmails Nora as easily as he would eat his breakfast. Krogstad is that vile, low masculine type that all gentlemen scorn and all women fear, and Ibsen makes him a lawyer!

It is not strange that Ibsen should have an aversion to scholars, for his own life was denied education and yet he was completely a "man of letters." As Ibsen delights in making the lawyer a scalawag, so he delights in presenting fools under the guise of "scholars." Dr. George Tesman, a young scholar (Hedda Gabler) and an aspirant for a vacant professorship is a typical representation of Ibsen's "Scholars". He is a savant, a pedantic clown, who enjoys surrounding himself with the dust of ancient learning and in sniffing the smell of musty folios¹. Tesman makes as foolish a husband as a scholar and teacher, thereby giving Ibsen a chance to prove that scholars are no use for anything.....even as husbands.

1. Writings of Ibsen: Boyesen. Page 293.

Mr. Kroll (Rosmersholm) is the headmaster of a public school; he is a teacher and being a teacher Ibsen paints him with no tinted brushes. Kroll is the tale-bearer; he causes the unhappiness between Rebecca and Rosmer and seems to be satisfied with the results. Arnholm (Lady from the Sea) is another example of Ibsen's dislike for scholars, also Alfred Almers (Little Eyolf) is a scholar---and Ibsen makes him out a fool. Ibsen does not scoff at knowledge; but it is evident he has little faith in those who carry its flag, for in none of his plays does he ever defend scholars or teachers.

With one profession, however, Ibsen was in sympathy; that was the profession of medicine. Never did he treat a physician discourteously (in his plays). They always seemed to come out of the dramas as complete as they went in; they never suffered his scorn nor met with his criticism. Dr. Relling (Wild Duck) is the quiet professional type of man so admirable to us, and Ibsen gives him the charitable position of one whose chief aim in life was to make happiness and harmony prevail over sorrow and dissension. Dr. Relling cheers up Hjalmar and goads him on; he also saves the self-respect of his bibulous friend, Molrik, by persuading him that his habit of drinking is controlled by some inner and great force. In short, Dr. Relling is a man among men.

Dr. Wangel (The Lady from the Sea) is a cultivated, kindly and honorable man. Ibsen presents him in the light of a modern Solomon--permitting his wisdom and sound reasoning to keep Ellida, his wife, from the romantic attachment of "The Stranger."

Thus Ibsen takes the three professions----Law, Divinity and Physic, and slices them into pieces, casting the first two aside, only claiming medicine as the worthy profession. He also tosses aside the profession of teaching, and uses, in his writings, every means to show the ugly side of this profession. While it is not for us to criticize Ibsen's judgment, yet I think----using his environment again as my basis----he was perfectly justified in taking the stand that he does, for we must remember, Henrik Ibsen was seeing always "the darker side of life."

LADY INGER OF OSTRAT

The source of this play is historical. It dates back to that period when Norway was going through a period of national degradation. The real Lady Inger was Fru Inger Ottisdatter Gldenlove who was a very important woman during the sixteenth century. She was acclaimed to be very patriotic; but research has proven later that her patriotism was stirred by the desire for glory and for social position. Ibsen has taken this historical figure and painted her with the rosy tint of an artist's imagination.

The scene opens in a castle and we find the peasants of Norway, groaning under the Danish yoke, asking Lady Inger to furnish them with arms in order to revolt against the oppressors. Lady Inger desires to help them, but her hands are tied because her son----an illegitimate child born of an illicit love affair before her marriage with the Swedish Chancellor Sten Sture. She has never seen this son because he was taken away from her by the father immediately after his birth. Though she has married and borne three other children, they can never take the place of this first born child.

Thus the central theme of the play is the story of a mother who plunges into intrigue and crime in order to aid an unknown son who in the end becomes her victim. She gambles

everything for him and in the end has him murdered believing him to be the legitimate son of Sten Sture. Her mistake is discovered when a ring is found about the murdered boy's neck. Ibsen has used all the melodramatic situations here----for he has the tense scene where Lady Inger stands outside while Olaf kills the supposed Sten Stensson, and he has the stirring climax of Lady Inger's realization that she has murdered her own son. Her cry is:-

"The ring! The ring! Sten Sture's ring! Oh God,
Oh God,-my son!"¹

The sub-plot of this play is the violent fascination that Elaine, her daughter has for Nils Lykke, the betrayer and practical murderer of her sister, Lucia. In this story Ibsen allows a splendid type of girl to become seduced by a man whom she knows is dangerous. When Elaine first meets Nils she scorns his attentions. She casts his gift of flowers at his feet, and refuses to be anything but condescending to him. Yet in the last scene she gives him her body. She clings to him and tells him that she has waited only for his coming. All the time Nils Lykke is only playing his part. He has no use for Elaine except to urge her to free him from the Castle. When he went to her room, he went not desirous and amorous, but rather as a Judas--- he kissed her only to betray her. Before he entered her

everything for him and is not at all his own
belonging but is the property of the
the state. It is the property of the state
and the state is the owner of it. The state
is the owner of the property of the state
and the state is the owner of the property
of the state. The state is the owner of
the property of the state. The state is
the owner of the property of the state.

The state is the owner of the property
of the state. The state is the owner of
the property of the state. The state is
the owner of the property of the state.
The state is the owner of the property
of the state. The state is the owner of
the property of the state. The state is
the owner of the property of the state.
The state is the owner of the property
of the state. The state is the owner of
the property of the state. The state is
the owner of the property of the state.
The state is the owner of the property
of the state. The state is the owner of
the property of the state. The state is
the owner of the property of the state.

The state is the owner of the property
of the state. The state is the owner of
the property of the state. The state is
the owner of the property of the state.
The state is the owner of the property
of the state. The state is the owner of
the property of the state. The state is
the owner of the property of the state.

room, he contemplated:

"Elaine! Ah, if that could be! Were it possible to.....And why should I not? Am I not still myself? Says not the song:-

Fair maidens a-many they sigh and they pine
"Oh, God, that Nils Lykke were mine, mine,
mine."¹

The lines of a conceited, cocksure Don Juan. In fact Ibsen's Nils Lykke reminded me of Zorilla's "Don Juan de Tenorio." In the face of one wrong they could commit another----Nils Lykke seduced and left Lucia to go home and pine away, yet he worried not about betraying her sister. Don Juan would seduce his own daughter born of an illicit love affair fifteen years back. Neither men had a conscience.

"The Lady of Ostrat" was one of the gloomiest plays I have ever read. An oppressive sadness pervades the piece from beginning to end. It is too grave, it savours too much of tombs and coffins. The spectre of death dances like some triumphant ghost from act to act.

Elaine's talk with her mother in the first act reveals a shocking case of maternal laxness. We hear that she forces her eldest daughter, Merete, into an unhappy marriage, that her second child, Lucia lies confined in the vaults because

There, in the morning:

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

"I think so, it's not a bad idea if possible."

Lady Inger's indomitable will broke the girl's spirit, and that she herself, (Elaine) is probably to be martyred on love's altar to further the mother's ends.

Ibsen reveals in this play a sordidness of life and a futility of living. The Mother, for all her intrigue, ended in murdering her only son, and Elaine waiting with the glory of youth for her Prince finally sells her soul for the paltry sum of a few false endearments to a man who has practically murdered her beloved sister. We leave Elaine, frantic after learning that Nils was Lucia's seducer, groaning that he has----"Made shipwreck of my soul."

And the curtain falls upon the prostrate mother who can only cry out:---

"What lack I? One coffin more.

A grave beside my child---"1.

THE FEAST AT SOLHAUG

In the preface to this play, Ibsen writes:

".....The Feast at Solhaug like all my other dramatic works, is an inevitable outcome of the tenor of my life at a certain period."¹ "The tenor of my life at a certain period." How true this statement is! For certainly it is always the genius of Ibsen that writes, spontaneously... like a spark which ignites against the friction of a magnetic metal.

There is no doubt that during the writing of this play Ibsen was much influenced by the French School. "The Feast at Solhaug" has that crispness of dramatic action which marks the French plays. For instance, there are misunderstandings kept up through the careful avoidance of the use of proper names; there is the cup of poison that comes into so many hands, but is never consumed, and through all these situations one finds an ingenious dovetailing of incidents.

The plot is slight. We have the rivalry of an older and a younger woman for the love of a man who is proscribed on an unjust accusation and is pursued by the king's emissaries. These two women are sisters, Margit and Signe, and the dramatic conflict is brought on by the visit of the outlawed Gudmund, after seven years' absence, to the house of Bengt, and to whom

THE STATE OF TEXAS

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

ALBINO, IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND THE LAND OFFICE.

AT A PUBLIC HEARING, HELD AT THE LAND OFFICE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

IN SENATE, FEBRUARY 1, 1882.

Margit is espoused in an unhappy marriage. Her youthful passion for Gudmund returns; but he turns his affection toward Signe, the younger sister. When Margit discovers their love-affair, she attempts to poison her husband, Bengt, thinking that Gudmund might love her again if she were free. Her attempt is thwarted by a kind fate, and later a still kinder fate chooses to set her free by having Bengt felled in battle.

The drama rushes to a swift climax, and the play ends with Signe and Gudmund joining hands, while Margit makes ready to retire into a nunnery.

"The Feast At Solhaug" is not as gloomy as "Lady Inger." In fact, we might dare to say it was cheerful; that is, as cheerful a piece as Ibsen might ever write. He chose to alleviate Margit's torture of an unhappy bondage by killing off Bengt----an unexpected consideration from one like Ibsen whose ruling law is the wholesome discipline of sorrow. He gives us, also, a worthy lover, Gudmund, who seeks not to betray women like his predecessor, Nils Lykke; but rather to aid them and to befriend them. Gudmund loved for love's sake; Nils Lykke loved for mere physical sensations and for egotistical purposes.

This play has been denounced by Ibsen, himself, who has admitted it to be one of the weakest things in the canon of his works. But, on the whole, the piece displays a gathering

of speed toward higher achievements in dramatic technique. Ibsen, in this play, forgets melodrama; he does not tinge every word with subtle irony; he tries to allow some of life's illusions to pass unscathed from the destructive criticism of his microscopic glances. In fact, as William Archer writes in his "Introduction to The Feast of Solhaug:-"

"There is a certain lilting melody in many passages, and the whole play has not unfairly been said to possess the charm of a northern summer night in which the glimmer of twilight gives place only to the gleam of morning."¹

THE VIKINGS AT HELGELAND

"The Vikings of Helgeland" is distinctly related to mythical material, and Ibsen is directly indebted to the Volsung-Saga for the basis of his play. Yet, withal, he does not fail to keep it plainly "Ibsenite", for his ideas and attitudes toward life are revealed as only Henrik Ibsen can reveal them. He resolutely deviated from the ancient story, and was free to follow his own course in the delineation of character.

The plot of this story is simple, and it is during this drama that Ibsen first treats the theme with which later he becomes so much concerned---the necessity of truth as the basis for every human relation; for it is the lie which Gunnar and Sigurd conspire to tell that is the root of the whole tragedy.

Gunnar is a simple man, utterly inefficient, and he goes to Sigurd seeking his aid to win the beautiful Hiordis who, during a banquet, makes the statement that any man may win her who slays the terrible bear that guards her room. Sigurd takes upon himself the part of the magnanimous hero and performs the deed. He carries away Hiordis and gives her to Gunnar, and she believes all the while that it was Gunnar who slew the beast.

But Dagny, the wife of Sigurd, when she hears of the story

THE VISITOR AT BATH

"The visitor at Bath," is a story which

is written in a style, and which is almost entirely

unknown to the reader of the day. But, when he

comes and tells us that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

The story of this story is simple, and it is a story of

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

and that it is a story of the

from her husband becomes infuriated at the cowardly act of Gunnar. She, in a moment of anger, tells Hiordis the truth.

"It shall not be hidden, I held my peace till thou didst mock at my father and my dead brothers; I held my peace while Ornulf was here, lest he should learn that Thorolf fell by a dastard's hand. But now, praise Gunnar nevermore for that deed in Iceland; for Gunnar is a coward! The sword that lay drawn between thee and the bear-slayer hangs at my husband's side---the ring thou didst take from thy arm thou gavest to Sigurd. (Takes it off and holds it aloft). Behold it.¹"

From this moment on Hiordis became as a madwoman. She sought revenge; she became fierce, gloomy and fearful. Her fury incited men to discord, and she revelled in the thought of bloodshed and murder. When Sigurd finally reveals to her his love, she decides to have him, at all cost. The price is heavy, for she, herself, murders him,-it being the only medium through which he can ever be hers. She cries to him:-

"Sigurd, my brother,-now art thou mine at last."
and his reply was:-

"Now less than ever. Here our ways part; for I am
a Christian man."²

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer Vol. II Page 67

2. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer Vol. II Page 110

The drama ends with a touch of irony, for both Dagny and Gunnar still believe that the two were true. Dagny thinks Hiordis killed Sigurd from great hatred, and Gunnar thinks that she has slain Sigurd to keep him from engaging in a combat with him; a combat that was to have taken place the next morning.

Ibsen, even in this drama, does not lose his sense of satire. He keeps his cynical attitude toward love, and allows each character to be deprived of his beloved. One of the most powerful scenes in this play is that of Ornulf's return where he is bewailing the loss of his sons in battle---and finds out that Gunnar has just murdered his only surviving son, Thorolf. We can see here that Ibsen is destined for future heights as a playwright, for already at an early age he has achieved the art of stage technique. His exposition, development, and the carrying on of the interest from act to act is perfectly well done, and he shows a particularly fine aptitude for gradually lifting veils, and making each new discovery involve a striking change in the relations of the characters to one another. This aptitude he manifests to a still greater extreme in his later play called "Ghosts."

When I consider "The Vikings at Helgeland" as a single play, there is much to be criticised; but my duty here is to consider it as one of many, and, in doing so I can see clearly what a magnificent process of development Ibsen is destined to

go through. Take, for instance, the character of Hjordis in comparison to Hedda Gabler---is it not easy to perceive that already Ibsen is on the road to depicting revengeful women? In Hjordis he subconsciously lays the foundation for his later feminine characters---characters such as Nora Helmer, Helen Alving and Rebecca West.

LOVE'S COMEDY

This play "Love's Comedy" was received with an outburst of indignation simply because to a certain class of people it was immoral. But that was a poor excuse; the play had many faults, but immorality was not among them. In the first place the character-drawing is often crude, the action though full of effective by-play, is extremely slight, and the sensational climax has little to do with human nature.

"Love's Comedy" is not a satire; it is more than a satire. Ibsen's exuberant humor has a bitter core, and the laughter, that rings through it, is the harsh, implacable laughter of Carlyle. The real sting of this piece lay in the merciless portrayal of the trivialities of persons, or classes, high in their own esteem. Ibsen was bored with the conventionalities of his time; namely, the shrill raptures of aunts and cousins over an engaged pair; the satisfied smile of enterprising mothers as they reckon up the tale of daughters safely married off under their auspices, and the asinine goo-gooing of spinsters over the inevitable blushing-bride-to-be.

The situation of the play is this:

Mrs. Halon has two daughters who are beloved by two

men---a theological student, Lind who loves Anna, and a poet, Falk, who cares for Svanhild. Lind and Anna are caught by conventions, and settle down into the commonplace life of home and babies. But Falk and Svanhild are more clairvoyant. They see before them two instances of a romance-gone-cold. One case is Styver who for years has aspired to the hand of Miss Jay; but la question d'argent has hindered them from marrying, and now, practical and middle-aged, they see only marriage as a business-like partnership. Once Miss Jay tries to revive the old glamour of romance;

"Now let's be tender! Look how softly floats
Queen Luna on her throne o'er lawn and lee!--
Well, but you are not looking!

but Styver responds gloomily:

"Yes, I see;

I'm thinking of promissory notes."¹

For Miss Jay and Styver the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow has proved to be only an earthen ware full of grinning things that mock at any romantic aspirations.

A second case of love withering with age is the Reverend Mr. Straamand and his wife, Maren. They married under the most romantic conditions; but Falk and Svanhild find them at middle-age, mildly prosperous and parents to

twelve children; "with a near prospect of the thirteenth."¹

Life seems to Falk and Svanhild as something sordid. They figure that marriage makes people lose their individualities which become submerged in the mere effort to provide for numerous offspring. They picture marriage as nothing more than animal-life---there is a birth---there is breeding---and there is death.

It is in order to escape this lot that Falk and Svanhild, after having tasted the pure bliss of love's avowal, resolve to separate rather than face the certainty of being gradually swamped in the slowly torturing disillusionising trivialities of matrimony. How could they keep the rosy bloom of physical love awake if they were continually pressed for money? How could they retain their equanimity of temper if their spiritual selves were shattered to bits by mundane worries?

So, they decide that marriage for them is impossible and Svanhild tosses away Falk's ring, crying joyously-

"Now for this earthly life I have forgone thee,-

But for the life eternal I have won thee!"²

Thus Ibsen shows that "marriage for love" is an institution beset with pitfalls. Rather he praises the French idea of "mariage de convenance." This "mariage de covenance" is Ibsen's only defense of matrimony. Let marriage be something as cool as a business arrangement--

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer: Vol. I. Page 243

2. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer: Vol. I. Page 300

CHIEF

let not the mystical moon beguile you into an institution
that fetters your soul with heavy chains---be free from
the passion of a youthful love so that the dying embers
of old age may not feel too chilling upon your withering
body.....so runs Ibsen's advice as I gleaned it from
the three acts of "Love's Comedy."

THE PRETENDERS

This play of Ibsen may be proposed as a model to other historic dramatists, because any inventions that he has added to this play supplement rather than contradict the historic records. In this play Ibsen covers a period of twenty two years, between the folkmote in Bergen, 1218, and Skule's death, 1240, and the leading characters are absolutely historical.

Although the action of this drama belongs to the thirteenth century, yet Ibsen has made the problem a modern one. Briefly, it is a tragedy of doubt. Hakon is the serene, self-assured, and confident man; Skule is the man of self-questioning and the man of indecision---in fact, doubt paralyses his will in the moment when indecision is suicidal. Ibsen has painted Skule with a deft hand. We can see that his thirst for glory, his insatiable desire for power predicts the tragic doom which finally betakes him.

From the very start of the play the antithesis between the two pretenders is strongly marked, for the scene opens with Hakon, self-assured and secure, standing outside the church awaiting the outcome of his mother's ordeal---for Hakon had permitted her to submit to the ordeal of bearing glowing irons in order to prove he is the son of King Hakon

THE PLAYERS

This play of lives and death is a model
to other dramatic literature, because the characters that
he has added to this play are important factors in the development
of the dramatic action. In this play there are a number
of events, two years, between the Tolstoy in 1881, and
and Tolstoy's death, 1910, and the leading characters are

mainly historical.

Although the action of this play is set in
the year 1881, Tolstoy was not yet a writer of fiction
and, finally, it is a tragedy of a kind. Tolstoy is the
central, self-sufficient, and consistent man; Tolstoy is the
of self-questioning and the man of intellect--in that
Tolstoy carried his will in the world; when Tolstoy is
original. Tolstoy has painted Tolstoy with a very real, very
and not that his third son, his youngest son, Tolstoy
for Tolstoy is the tragic hero which Tolstoy makes

From the very start of the play the antithesis between
the two protagonists is strongly marked. For the scene opens
with Tolstoy, self-sufficient and secure, standing outside the
world against the world of the world's world--the
Tolstoy and Tolstoy are in the world of Tolstoy
Tolstoy is in order to Tolstoy in the world of Tolstoy

Soerreson---but Skule, who stands on the opposite side of the square, is distracted with hope and fear, and is restless and uneasy. Even after the ordeal has been announced successful, Skule refuses to accept the verdict, but insists upon a vote by the assembled warriors which results in Hakon's favor. Then, Skule offers in marriage his daughter, Margaret, to Hakon, meanwhile continuing his intrigue against the King.

One of the outstanding characters in this play was Bishop Nicholas. This clergyman is endorsed with Mephistophelian characteristics, and plays the part of the unswerving villain, for he continues his sinful plottings until his death---and even after that he returns from hell as an evil ghost who urges Skule to kill his own grandson---Margaret's child.

It seems to me that Bishop Nicholas provides the "conflict" in this play, for it is he who encourages Skule in his nefarious intrigues against Hakon; it is he who, (fearing that Skule will abandon his pretensions to the throne if he is convinced Hakon is the rightful heir,) induces Skule, by an artful trick, to burn unread the letter containing the proof of Hakon's power, and like Delilah with Samson, only uses his knowledge to destroy the power, for Bishop Nicholas does everything to undermine the king's faith in himself, a faith which makes Hakon the man he is; it is the Bishop who

feeds the fire of Skule's ambition with his artful insinuations and cunning plans; it is he who keeps the realm in a state of turmoil and upheaval by his fiendish plottings and infernal policies.

The motif of this drama, after the antithesis between the two pretenders, is the theft of Hakon's kingly thought by Skule. Hakon's mission was to eliminate sectional hate and put in its stead a national feeling that would make a strong, united Kingdom; Hakon told his idea to Skule who immediately appropriates it as his own. Of course such a nature as Skule's could never carry out such a plan. To Skule the crown meant purple cloth, rich trappings, and power, while to Hakon it meant an arduous task for the welfare of his land.

Peter, Skule's illegitimate son was for a time the Deus ex machina, and I felt that Ibsen was going to end his tale by using this feeble device, for Peter inspires his father with new hopes, and the two seem near victory. But Ibsen's mind---even then in the embryo---was too great to employ tricks. He allowed the inevitable ending to come with a crash, for Skule and his son were both exterminated by the furious multitude in the monastery of Eglesaeter.

This play, "The Pretenders", was written with true dramatic instincts. It has concentrated action, intense

reads the title of the book, and the author's name is printed at the bottom of the title page. The book is bound in a plain, light-colored cover, and the title is printed in a simple, black font.

The book is a small, pocket-sized volume, and it is written in a clear, concise style. The author's name is printed at the bottom of the title page, and the title is printed in a simple, black font. The book is bound in a plain, light-colored cover, and the title is printed in a simple, black font.

The book is a small, pocket-sized volume, and it is written in a clear, concise style. The author's name is printed at the bottom of the title page, and the title is printed in a simple, black font. The book is bound in a plain, light-colored cover, and the title is printed in a simple, black font.

interest, and ordinary dialogue. Ibsen in this early play drew one of his characters---Skule. Always the introspective, self-analytic man, Ibsen realized how unsecure he felt himself a dramatist. Was he treading on unlawful grounds---like Skule? The scene in "The Pretenders" between Skule and the Icelandic Scald Jatgrir, has been frequently quoted as applying to the author himself:

"Skule: To be a king, what gift is needful for me?"

"Jatgrir: Not that of doubt; thou wouldst not question thus."

"Skule: What gift is needful."

"Jatgrir: Lord, thou art king."

"Skule: Art thou at all times sure thou art a poet."¹

This play of Ibsen's is one of the links in that strong chain which keeps his dramas in sequence. For we have only to compare Skule, Hakon and Bishop Nicholas with Gunnar, Sigurd and Ornulf to see we have passed from marble characters to more profoundly-studied human beings touched with the exquisite gesture of an artist's hand. Just as Skule's attempt to plagiarise Hakon's ideas points backward to Gunnar's taking the honor of Sigurd's bravery to himself, so the satiric rhymes of the Bishop's ghost point forward to the indignation and irony of his next two plays---Brand and Peer Gynt.

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

BRAND

This play of Ibsen's, written in the summer of 1865, was the beginning of his European fame. His "Brand" was the play that made the poet's name known beyond Norway, because of its intellectual suggestiveness and philosophical mysticism many compared it to Shakespeare's "Hamlet" and Goethe's "Faust."

"Brand" was inspired by Ibsen's scorn of his King who, in a moral crisis, skulked away from duty and left Denmark to her fate. The Norwegian Seer became indignant at such an action and wrote "Brand" as a passionate appeal to the Norwegian people.

Brand, the hero of Ibsen's dramatic poem, is a priest who accepts the ideal demand of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, and determines to abide by it. Brand is an utter Deist; he is resolved to be true to the call of God. In this play, Ibsen shows a remarkable development in his technique of Exposition.

The opening scene puts the situation vividly before the reader or the audience. We see Brand with a peasant and his son who act as guides, crawling westward through rain and fog. The peasant and the son realize the danger and plead with Brand to turn back.

THE

The play of the "Theatre" is the answer to
 the question of the "Theatre" in the "Theatre".
 The play of the "Theatre" is the answer to
 the question of the "Theatre" in the "Theatre".
 The play of the "Theatre" is the answer to
 the question of the "Theatre" in the "Theatre".

"Theatre" is the answer to the question of
 the "Theatre" in the "Theatre". The play of
 the "Theatre" is the answer to the question of
 the "Theatre" in the "Theatre". The play of
 the "Theatre" is the answer to the question of
 the "Theatre" in the "Theatre".

The play of the "Theatre" is the answer to
 the question of the "Theatre" in the "Theatre".
 The play of the "Theatre" is the answer to
 the question of the "Theatre" in the "Theatre".
 The play of the "Theatre" is the answer to
 the question of the "Theatre" in the "Theatre".
 The play of the "Theatre" is the answer to
 the question of the "Theatre" in the "Theatre".
 The play of the "Theatre" is the answer to
 the question of the "Theatre" in the "Theatre".

"No human power can here uphold you.

Frail is the ice-thin as a sheet!

Stay, death is yawning at your feet."¹

Their exhortations have no effect; Brand is obdurate. He insists that God has bade him keep on and he will welcome cataracts, chasms and death rather than betray his mission. It is these few alarming statements of Brand that makes us realize the uncompromising strength, harshness, and grimness that we are going to find in this drama. It is a drama, daring in thought and frank in language; Ibsen has not spared his reader. He is out with fire and tong to condemn halfness, a contemptible expression. Amid the complication of the plot, Ibsen clings tenaciously to the one-root idea: "All or Nothing." The play is a terrible arraignment of the half-heartedness of the Norwegian people: Ibsen has had enough of compromise. Brand, speaking as Ibsen's mouthpiece, says:

"That which thou art, be it completely,

Not only piecemeal and discreetly."²

Brand keeps on his way; the clouds pass off, and as morning breaks he meets Einar, a young artist with Agnes, his betrothed; they are the embodiment of joy and mirth. In this

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Vol. III

Page 4.

2. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer Vol. II, Page 22.

The purpose of this report is to

present the results of the study

and to discuss the implications

of the findings for the future

of the research in this field

and to suggest some possible

ways of improving the situation

in the future. The study was

conducted over a period of six

months and the results are

presented in the following

pages. The study was

conducted in the following

ways. The study was

conducted in the following

ways. The study was

conducted

in the following

ways. The study was

conducted in the following

ways. The study was

conducted in the following

ways. The study was

conducted

in the following

scene Ibsen has a chance to give full vent to his morbid thoughts through Brand. He chides Einar and Agnes for their careless gaiety; he tells them that he is homeless and alone, and when Einar tells Brand that he thought his (Brand's) home was here, Brand answers "My way lies past here----beyond, far beyond." This remark is strictly "Ibsenite," and especially at this period when the dramatist has left his country, forever.

The second act of this play contains one of Ibsen's later dramatic-habits. In this act, Brand crosses a ford during the wildest storm to reach a dying man to help him make peace with God. No one dares to go with him; all are sorry for the dying man, but their pity arouses no action. Just as Brand is ready to depart, Agnes, Einar's betrothed, steps forward and takes her seat in the boat; she scorns Einar and the crowd. Together they reach their destination, and Agnes, from that time forward, is fascinated by his lofty strength and magnificent bearing. Thus it is that in this act that Ibsen brings Brand, Agnes and Einar together: Brand, uncompromising, and stern; Einar, pleading and solicitous; Agnes, the one who must make the choice. Brand says:

"At the crossway standst thou:-Chose."¹

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Vol. III

How this command points forward to Nora Helmer who must make her choice---to Ellida Wangle who must choose either the stranger or her husband, Dr. Wangle---Ibsen is forever putting an individual between the devil and the deep-blue sea and saying "choose." The choice is generally determined by the state of mind of the person choosing; this "yes" or "no" is the balancing power of the drama.

The third act of "Brand" is one of the highest emotion. Brand has told his mother, an avaricious woman, that he will not go to her deathbed unless she renounce all her property and wealth to God. The mother is dying and she summons her son; but he refuses to go. His refusal is not prompted by a hardness of heart or a needless cruelty; it is simply that Brand insists one cannot bargain with God---"He must get all or nothing." When the Doctor tells Brand if he really loved his mother he would not hesitate to go flying at her request, Brand says:

"Never did word so sorely prove
The smirch of his, as this word Love;
.....Whose path's the steep and perilous slope
Let him but love,--and he may shirk it;
If he prefer sin's easy circuit,
Let him but love,--he still may hope;

If God he seeks, but fears the fray,
 Let him but love,--'tis straight his prey;
 If with wide-open eyes he err,
 Let him but love,--there's safety there."¹

This harange against love is the poet speaking aloud his thoughts. Ibsen did not disbelieve in love; but he did argue that most love was a shield by which men lived in hidden sin.

As I read this drama I kept seeing again and again lines which seemed to point a finger toward Ibsen's future dramas. One place Brand says:

"Blood of children must be spilt
 To atone the parent's guilt."²

How pertinent a remark when put as a subtitle to "Ghosts." Somehow I can picture Ibsen thumbing the pages of his old dramas in search for new ideas; he wears a smile of gratification as his eyes meet those two lines! With eager fervor he starts, perhaps, this drama "Ghosts"---a drama motivated by two little lines in the superb drama "Brand."

I think too much has been made of Agnes and the son, Alf. We forget that Alf's death was caused by Brand practicing his theory---"All or Nothing." How, consistently, could he have

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Vol. III, Page 389.

2. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Vol. III, Page 261.

If you are here, and I am not,
Let me know, -- I'll be glad to see you;
If you are not here, and I am not,
Let me know, -- I'll be glad to see you.

This is the first time I have ever
seen you. I am glad to see you,
and I am glad to see you. I am glad to see you,
and I am glad to see you.

I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you,
and I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you.

I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you,
and I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you.

I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you,
and I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you.

I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you,
and I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you.

I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you,
and I am glad to see you, and I am glad to see you.

taken his son, Alf, away from the chill weather when he was so stern where other's happiness was concerned? No, Brand was a man who was not mediocre; he was a hero of the whole. His "All or Nothing" idea was carried out by him to his own destruction; but his destruction was the more interesting because his staunch belief in his own ideal caused it.

Ibsen's sympathy was with Brand; he regards Brand's sacrifices as the inexorable law of nature which it is futile for a human being to evade. This play is a philosophical treatise concerning the higher and the lesser creature; the tenor of Ibsen's philosophy inclines toward the idea that the lesser creature is always being sacrificed to the higher creature.

Ibsen is not quibbling with right or wrong. He is singularly disinterested in Brand's outcome; but he is energetically fighting against the hypocritical insincerity, the laxity and the half-heartedness of society. The key-note of this drama lies in Brand's motto: "All or Nothing."

In this play, Ibsen is taking one step nearer his "Realistic Age." He is becoming interested in the falseness of society, and he is preparing himself for these later great dramas which are inspired by this same anti-society feeling termed "Ibsenism."

PEER GYNT

This is the nearest to gaily which Ibsen will ever come in his dramas. "Peer Gynt" is not the work of an unhappy man. Rather, it is the work of a man who has a twinkle in his eye. Peer Gynt's character is conceived with gusto; there is an exuberance of spirit manifest in every adventure. One feels that Peer "lies himself great;" he lives a fantastic existence, and turns a careless back to anything that might disturb his easy life.

This play was suggested by a folk tale in Asbjornsen and Moe's "Norwegian Fairy Tales;" but the hints which set the writer's imagination to work were very slight. Ibsen merely got the idea of this senseless, easy-going Peer from the "Tales," and then proceeded to add event upon event that would make for a weird fantasy.

The work is primarily a satire on the Norwegian national character; Peer represents the modern Norseman, whose boastful patriotism is mere mawkish sentimentality and egoism. I quote these lines from the play to illustrate:

"The cow gives cake and the bullock mead;
Ask not if its taste be sour or sweet;
The main matter is, and you mustn't forget it,
It's all of it home-brewed."¹

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Vol. IV.

This is an obviously satirical passage; Ibsen meant it as a dagger-thrust to the self-complacent Norwegians.

Peer, himself, is the typical expression of the national vices of the Norwegian people; though to his neighbors he represents a slovenly fellow, to himself he is a tremendous success. How Ibsen loves to create a character that comes from one's own neighborhood and make him a mirror for all of us to "see ourselves as others see us!"

Peer Gynt has for his ideal the utterly selfish gratification of his own individual, disregarding the rest of the world. His one desire is to be romantic; but he lacks the fine courage of a true romancer. As a whole, Peer is the gigantic prototype of Sentimental Tommy. He is human, appealing, and entirely lovable. His imaginative genius surpasses everything comprehensible in Ase's death-scene. Can not you picture this dissolute son coming to his mother's bed, and while she dies, transport her in a wild imaginative chase to the gate of St. Peter? Is not this very act the epitome of gentleness, pity, and indulgence?

The drama should be treated simply as a phantasmagoria of purely human pathos.¹ Ibsen lets down the bars of restraint, and permits his play to have pathos, to stir the heart, and for a time, one feels he is in sympathy with the protagonist.

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Preface to "Peer Gynt". Page 20.

This is an extremely well-known fact; I have heard it so

a frequent remark to the self-satisfied Americans.

But, alas! in the typical American of the national

views of the American people; I have heard it so

very much a slightly fellow, in regard to it a

country. Not less love to create a

first one's own personality and make it a

on to "and ourselves as others see us."

There must be for him the

attention of his own individual, I

world. His one desire is to be

time course of a new movement. It is

world's progress of individualism. It is

and finally I believe. The

other consequences in the world's

this discipline now leading to the

the progress of a world's

of it. It is not this very

very, and

The world is

of the world's progress.

and progress in the world's

the world is in the

I believe that the world's

the world's progress.

The culminating points of this drama are generally said to be: the first act with its swift movement and picture of life, Ase's death-scene, and the speech of the Pastor over a grave in the last act. These three scenes are splendid. One can foresee the genius of Ibsen leaping with great bounds. His technique is quite flawless, and his delineation of character so perfect that there is hardly a more life-like creation in the range of drama than that of Ase.

The plot of this drama is very simple; Ibsen still clings to his "youth until death" method, for we tract Peer from twenty years to an old man. The play has no conflict; Peer grapples with no problem, neither does he have to make a decision that will entail any embarrassing results. Peer Gynt is the embodiment of a careless sans-gene type. If he desires, he gratifies that desire; if he hates, he wastes no time in telling the object of his hatred that he desires his or her removal.

This play coming after "Brand" makes us wonder if Ibsen did not desire to find a contrast of the forceful Brand, and did so in the pliable Peer. Brand compels life; Peer is compelled by life, and he is tossed to and fro much like a cork on a broiling sea. Brand is assertive; Peer just exists---he exerts no good and no evil.

This drama----like its predecessors----has the love of a good woman, Solveig, to take the vagabond Peer into her arms at his last moment. The ending----like its predecessors----leaves us in a questioning frame of mind. We feel the problem is still unsolved and that Ibsen has been fooling us all the time; he seems to become suddenly insincere, disinterested and above all, hilarious. This play ties Ibsen up with his later "question-plays," and the brilliant originality so manifest here becomes more and more evident as we follow him into his Realistic Period.

EMPEROR & GALILEAN

Jaeger¹ says of this work:

"It occupies an interesting position among Ibsen's works. It is the last of his historical dramas, and stands, in its final form, with all its mysticism, midway between two such delineations of modern life as "The League of Youth" and "The Pillars of Society."

It is quite true that Ibsen's "Emperor & Galilean" occupies an interesting place among his works. It is unique, for Ibsen instead of satirizing some social evil, turns his attention to history. A psychologist might conclude that this sudden change from social satire to history was Ibsen's ploy to relieve a mental strain. As we know, most all of his previous works had caused trouble; he had to be ready to fight the battle, as it were, to save his name as a dramatist. People were critical; the sensitive mind of Ibsen reacted against these criticisms by writing a historical drama, by delving his tired brain into musty history, and by creating a magnificent piece of work---a piece of work that people could not find fault with. Probably the reason they could not find fault with it was because Ibsen had written it so that critic and audience would be in the dark as to its real meaning.

1. Life of Henrik Ibsen: Jaeger.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

The play discusses the problem of Paganism against Christianity. Emperor Julian rebels against both; Paganism starved one's body, was not there a reconciliation of some sort to be reached? As a result of this questioning, Emperor Julian becomes antagonistic to Christ; he worships Idols. As the play advances, a struggle for supremacy between the Emperor and the Galilean is the conflict. Julian is going to destroy the Christians. Ibsen sympathizes with his hero during the first part. Julian hates certain phases of Christianity---book-worship, hypocrisy and intolerance---Ibsen agrees with this side of Julian's rebellion; but as the play enters the second part, he disparages his hero. Ibsen tries to make us feel that to butt one's head against a stone wall is futile. Julian's cry at the end, "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean" seems to be a shy confession of the Norwegian Seer's philosophy. Man struggles; man fights; man battles; but to what avail? In the end one has to admit defeat, and bow obeisance to the very power that he tried in every way to thwart during life.

On the whole, this drama is not a very strong link in tying up Ibsen's gradual evolution. It is more a side-track; a romp across a field that gives Ibsen a "breathing-spell" before he returns to his polemical dramas again.

"Emperor & Galilean" stands for struggle toward the

golden-mean; and the higher synthesis of truth. In Julian's effort at a reconciliation of pagan beauty and Christian truth, he is a tragic failure---for having repudiated his mission, he cannot achieve the "vision-splendid" of the "Third empire, in which the twin-natured shall reign."¹

police-men, and the other members of the
club's effort at a demonstration of some sort
and then, as he is a little better--for having
reported his method, he cannot make the "vision"
unpleasant to the "old" people, in which the police-men
shall follow.

C. CRITICAL EVALUATION OF HIS FIRST PERIOD

There are two polemical works of Ibsen, written during his first period, which have a direct bearing on his later plays, and these are most probably the cause of his future success. Although these two plays are dissimilar in respect of maturity and depth, they have, in combination, given the public the impression that Ibsen's nature is primarily combative.

"Love's Comedy" is written on the behalf of beauty and poetry; "Brand" is written on the behalf of morals and religion, and in both these plays Ibsen has declared war and gone out to battle against the entire existing social status.

In these plays Ibsen reveals himself as a pessimist; but a pessimist whose pessimism is of a moral character, akin to indignation. Ibsen does not bemoan; his works are not a lamentation over the hapless lot of humanity, rather they are controversial, and resemble Plato's "Republic" in that they are always trying to corner someone and show him that every no may contain a yes.

Falk and Brand were burning with enthusiasm for freedom, and they raised the banner of revolution---to them life was destructive, and they sought refuge from the volcanoes by

C. CHRISTIAN WILSON OF THE WEST

1891

There are two political parties in the West, and

during the first party, which have a strong leaning to his

father's side, and it is not without the cause of his

father's success. Although there are some who distinguish in

the cause of industry and honesty, they have, in consequence,

given the world the impression that there is a large and

highly educated.

"There is a party" is written on the side of the party and

party; "There is a party" is written on the side of the party and

and in both these ways there has been a great deal of

parties and the party which is called the party.

In these days it is not unusual to find a party; it is

usually found in the party of a party, and it is

usually found in the party of a party, and it is

usually found in the party of a party, and it is

usually found in the party of a party, and it is

usually found in the party of a party, and it is

usually found in the party of a party, and it is

usually found in the party of a party, and it is

usually found in the party of a party, and it is

usually found in the party of a party, and it is

hiding themselves in themselves---but each falls a victim to his own guilt which he expiates in death. In the characters of Falk and Brand Ibsen has exerted all his strength to depict men who might carry over his meaning to the public: A combative spirit, an overflowing of pathos and tragedy, and a desperate butting of one's head against a stone wall....and what does it get one? Death.

After reading the plays of his first period we can easily perceive that Henrik Ibsen is not one of the happy poets. His dramas are not the easy themes of the optimist; they display attempt after attempt to gain a firm foothold in the muddy slime of the dramatist's field. He makes start after start, each start the run before the leap that is to carry him into his promised land; but it takes a long time before he arrives at the "leap" stage. Ibsen's plays show that his mind can not rest or be easy, and it tosses about like a fever-stricken babe who knows he can not get out of bed, but does not understand why. Like this sick child, Ibsen struggles against his besetting ills, and fights with every bit of resisting power against the cruel fever. Finally he emerges whole, and realizes that nothing matters save a healthy representation of one's own self.

"Lady Inger of Ostrat" is a historical tragedy in prose, and is an interesting piece of work; but lacks that strongly-marked originality which we subsequently find in him. Ibsen

immediately followed this play with "The Vikings at Helgeland," a dramatic adaptation of the ancient legend of the Volsungs; but "The Vikings" seems to me a weak plot, although such characterizations as Hjordis and Dagny are stupendous.

These two plays bring out the fact that Ibsen has peculiarities; he delights in placing a strong, fully developed masculine nature between two women, one a fierce and relentless spirit, the other full of womanly gentleness; thus he places Nils Lykke in "Lady Inger of Ostrat," between the gentle Eline and the designing Lady Inger, in "The Vikings" he places Sigurd between the faithful loving Dagny, and the furious Hjordis. In this same manner he afterwards places Brand between the wild woman, Gerd, his evil genius, and his delicate and feminine wife, Agnes.

Ibsen is pleased when he can bring out the lesson that the one who does the labor never gets the reward: Sigurd kills the bear and honestly wins Hjordis; Guldstad (Love's Comedy) is nothing but a sensible merchant, yet he wins Svanhild over the ideal Pegasus-rider, Falk. Thus Gunnar (The Vikings) and Guldstad (Love's Comedy) represent the pedestrian pair who win the two enchanted princesses whom the knights on steeds rescued.

Ibsen has a strong propensity for varying the same motives, and he is always going farther and farther into the depths; one feels that he digs down into his own inner being, and like a treasure-seeker, loses interest in all other treasures in hunting for the one he is in search of....and does he not find it? Even the most unconcerned reader of Ibsen could not help noticing that each new work is an advancement in dramatic art, and that with each one he had gone a step further into the realm of perfection.

In Ibsen's first period we find the polemical poet's taste for the tragical, and he seeks furiously to portray thrilling incidents, and paralyzing situations in order to gain his point. His dramas sweep across the horizon like some great typhoon that, while not causing destruction, yet foretells with dire wails, what is to come.

"The Pretenders" seems to me to be a piece of powerful writing. It is an old, old story; but what great author has ever lost a chance to write about an old tale; although he may dress it up in the gawdy style of modern times. Anyone who has read "Arabian Nights" will recall the story of Aladdin & Nureddin---the superior and the inferior being---an Aladdin nature as opposed to a Nureddin nature. Ibsen's Hakon and Skule are similar to Aladdin and Nureddin, for Hakon in the incarnation of fortune, victory, right and

confidence, while Skule is a brooder who is a prey to inward struggle and endless distrust; Skule lacks that inexpressable something that would make him valuable.

The conception of such a character as Skule, together with his inevitable entanglements, must have been some months in Ibsen's mind before it came to maturity; the tragic situation of such a figure could never have presented itself to Ibsen in the form, so to speak. Skule is the plagiarist of an idea and if we look back to "The Vikings" we can see that Gunnar was the thief of an achievement; thus we see the situation of this play prepared in Ibsen's "The Vikings." He looked back over his "baby-plays" and decided that from one of them he might draw the germ to write a better "baby-play," and this is exactly where Ibsen's ingeniousness comes to the front, for the man is positively wizard-like in his power to draw a rabbit from a supposedly empty hat. Everything Midas touched became gold; everything Ibsen touched became drama.

When "Brand" was finished, it took the public by surprise by the very novelty of its whole composition. In this play Ibsen laid aside all jesting, and bitter indignation was its one prevailing force. The pen of the dramatist has flown too rapidly in his hands, and we find that at times the flowing diction is not entirely controlled by a perfect sense of unity in style and tone. In this play,

like its predecessors, Ibsen has made his characters the butt of his own satire, and each character seems to be continually slapping one another in the face.

Brand is the mouthpiece for the author's thoughts, and he (Brand) goes to such extremes in his thinking that he topples over on one-side, and Ibsen turns the tables on Brand and condemns him for this one-sidedness. Altogether it is an extravagant piece of work, and has an advantage over the earlier plays because it is more than a biting satire on modern marriage; it arrives at a definite conclusion: that love must be either two things,--either lasting or imaginary. Here in "Brand" Ibsen pushed down a few more barriers which obstructed his view of the open field that lead to so-called "Ibsenism."

"Peer Gynt" has an object, and this object is to represent the moral nature of mankind from its seamy side. Peer Gynt tried to romance himself away from life by the aid of fancies. We find in this play a wealth of poetry and a depth of thought such as we never found in Ibsen's earlier works. It is in "Peer Gynt" that Henrik Ibsen gets a hold on the technique of drama; there is a strength of imagination and a vital humor in this play that continually piques one's curiosity as to what is coming.

like the "Punch" and "Joke" has made his appearance for

half of his own series, and each character seems to be

consequently appearing one another in the face.

There is the "Punch" and the "Joke" in the

and the "Punch" goes to such extent in his thinking that

he begins even to see things, and then turns the tables on

them and answers him for this and that.

It is an extraordinary case of wit, and has no parallel over

the world's eyes. It is more than a little better than

any other; it is a case of a certain kind of wit.

Now, what is the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

face of the "Punch" and "Joke" in the

Ibsen is not a moralist in this play; he is not writing from the didactic standpoint, and he succumbs to the call of philosophy. Ibsen does not try to root out the prevailing evil at any cost, as a moralist would attempt to do; but rather he tries to see whether or not this prevailing evil is not a "necessary" evil, thus taking a philosophical stand. This fact is brought out in Peer Gynt's statement:

"Some take to brandy, and others to lies."¹ That is really Ibsen talking, and he tries to shake from himself the dust of the positive, as it were, when he admits himself the author of such an intriguing piece of work as "Peer Gynt."

"Emperor & Galilean" is historical, and it is made up of two five-act dramas. In contrast to the play "The Pretenders," this drama is magnificent. Ibsen had lost the Skule-insecurity, and took on the Hakon-faith-in-my-own-ability idea.

The acts present a series of brilliant and powerful scenes in the life of Emperor Julian. This play is more of Ibsen enjoying himself at his work, for instead of hammering away at social hypocrisies he seems to take up history to relieve the nervous-strain that his mind is

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Vol. III

There is not a word in this story which is not
 written from the scientific standpoint, and the scientific
 is the only of philosophy. There is not a word
 and the scientific will be the best, as a scientific study
 cannot be said to be the best in the history of the
 this scientific will be not a "necessary" evil, thus
 making a philosophical study. This fact is known to
 the fact that a scientific

"Some take to heart, and others to heart,
 that is really the case, and he tries to make them
 know the best of the scientific, as it were, when he
 admits that the best of such an interesting piece of
 work is the best.

"There is a man, is scientific, and it is not
 to be the best of the scientific, as it were, when he
 "The scientific," this is the scientific, and he
 has the scientific, and he is the scientific, and
 in the scientific.

The scientific is a study of the scientific and scientific
 study in the life of the scientific. This study is not
 of the scientific, as it were, when he is not
 scientific, as it were, when he is not
 scientific, as it were, when he is not

undergoing. "Emperor & Galilean" interested me little; it seemed to play no important part in his development, and while I find certain parts of this play undoubtedly fascinating, I think, on the whole, it is rather tiresome.

Ibsen had certain ideas, and he managed to bring these ideas to the front in his early plays. For instance, he has beautifully embodied filial reverence; Nils Stenson's relations with Lady Inger is subtly, yet forcibly placed when Nils changes from a boy to a man in his determination to please her.....stranger though she may be to him. Peter's reverence (The Pretenders) for his royal father is depicted with great feeling by Ibsen. Frequently when Ibsen depicts love, he mingles it with admiration, especially when he treats female love for the male. An example of this is Eline (Lady Inger) Hjordis (The Vikings) Ingeborg (The Pretenders). Ibsen always tinges romantic love with this admiration so that his characters may be ruled by their head instead of their heart. Juliet did not admire Romeo in Shakespeare's immortal play; but Ibsen was determined that his characters should portray common-sense---let passion take care of itself.

Henrik Ibsen was in one respect always perfect---even from his first play on---perfect in his delineation of women. His women show an uncanny correlation with the real female species, almost as if he had been a woman himself, in

understand, "I never saw him," answered me I said;

it seemed to him a very important part in his life.

and said, "I am certain that of this of my own knowledge."

Thereafter, I think, on the whole, it is better known.

I have not seen him since, and he seemed to know that

there was no more in his life. For instance, he was

repeatedly asked about his whereabouts; his presence

was not known until he was found, not having been

seen since then. It was a day or two in his absence.

in place of... I never knew the way to him.

There is no more. The presence of the other father is

different from what he was at home. It seems to me that

there is a difference in his behavior, especially when

he is away from home. It is not the same as when he

is at home. I think that the other father is

more like a man who is not at home. It is not the same

as when he is at home. It is not the same as when he

is at home. It is not the same as when he is at home.

There is a difference in his behavior, especially when

he is away from home. It is not the same as when he

is at home. It is not the same as when he is at home.

There is a difference in his behavior, especially when

he is away from home. It is not the same as when he

some other life. Agnes and her love for her dead baby boy---could anything be more true to life? Can not you see her placing a candle in the window so that its light may fall on the child's grave, and give it one little gleam of Christmas comfort?

These first female figures augur well for Ibsen's future, for they prophesize the coming of such characters as Nora, Rebecca, Helen Alving and Hedda Gabler.

His first period has cleared the track, as it were, and we are now ready for his second period where he will come out like Solomon in all his glory, and leave us stricken blind by his very magnificence.

some other life. I know she has love for her dead
baby boy--would anything be more true to life? Can you
you see her looking a little in the window as if she
I don't say I'll be the child's friend, and give it the
little place of Christian comfort?
These things I don't know. I don't know what the doctor
thinks, for they are not the kind of such questions
as I have. I don't know, I don't know and I don't know.
His first letter was dated the first, as it was.
And we are now ready for his second which came in
will show you the doctor's view of the case, and I hope
we will be able to do it very soon.

THE LEAGUE OF YOUTH

This play, "The League of Youth," is the first realistic play written by Henrik Ibsen. One can easily see that the change from verse to prose did not come easily to him. He had outgrown his youthful romanticism, and he felt that he must come into contact with the reality. In writing a letter to Lucie Wolf¹ he remarked that he must cultivate, "the very much more difficult art of writing the genuine, plain language spoken in real life." as opposed to the romantic style of verse.

The play itself is a polemic against local politics with all its nastiness and wheels within wheels. It was a violent attack against the ambitious philanders who run from party to party in an attempt to gain a foothold. Altogether, Ibsen breaks away from the romantic inclinations of his first stage and we find him, now, as the complete realist.

The Protagonist in this play is Stensgard, who in the very first act delivers a clever and cutting speech against Chamberlain Bratsberg and his party. Stensgard is a young upstart who has made connections with Monsen's clique---- a clique far from being upright and honest. Stensgard starts the League of Youth, the object of which is to overthrow Bratsberg; but Bratsberg hearing the speech, believes it is

1. Correspondence. Letter 171, May, 1883

directed against his adversary, Monsen. For this reason Bratsberg sends an invitation to the violent orator to attend a party at his house. This invitation is the beginning of Stensgard's fall. He goes to the party, and makes a complete fool of himself by telling a fable about an eagle and a cuckoo and ends his myth by making an apology to Bratsberg for having called him such names in public. The Chamberlain is thunderstruck; he had thought that Stensgard's attack was against Monsen and on realizing the tirade was meant for him ordered the young man from his house.

The undaunted, impudent Stensgard lost no opportunity to show his teeth to the Chamberlain when he found out that Bratsberg was against him. This animosity existed throughout the drama, and it was an "eye for an eye" law every time the two met. Stensgard had planned to marry into the Bratsberg family,--Thora, the daughter of the Chamberlain, being extremely handy; but as the estrangement of the two men became more and more evident, Stensgard turned his "mercenary-affections" to Ragna Monsen--the other eligible "rich-girl." Ibsen has Stensgard lose both these damsels, but Stensgard, undaunted, provides himself with a widow, Mrs. Rundholmen. She, too, is lost to Stensgard, and the last scene finds him unloving and unloved.

discrepancy between the two accounts, however, for the

testimony of the witness in the latter case

is not in accord with the facts.

According to the testimony of the witness, and

there is a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

two accounts and a complete lack of identity of the

This play has one special bearing on Ibsen's development---an important feature---the character of Selma, Eric's wife, foreshadows the modern woman, notably the character of Nora Helmer. When Eric has lost his money and Selma finds it out through an accident, she becomes hysterical.¹

"How I have thirsted for a single drop of your troubles, your anxieties! But when I begged for it you only laughed me off. You have dressed me like a doll; you have played with me as you would play with a child..... how I yearned for a large, and high, and strenuous part in your life!.....I will not be treated as a last resource. I will have nothing to do with your troubles now! I wont stay with you! I will rather play and sing in the streets!"

What a portrayal of character! Here Ibsen has stepped from the romantic whimpers of Svanhild, Margaret and Lady Inger to a more definite and realistic demands of a Selma---the foundation for Nora, Helen and the inimitable Hedda of his later dramas!

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: Volume VI P. 130

the first was the receipt of letters on Monday
developed--on important business--and the second of
letters, this time, from the other side, which
the character of the letter, from the other side
many and also that of the person or persons, the
nature of the letter.

How I have waited for a letter from you
your letter, when you wrote! How often I
wondered for it you only; perhaps not. You
have written me like a letter; you have written
it as if you would give me a letter....
Now I wanted for a letter, and then, and
perhaps not in your letter!.... I will
not be so good as a letter, I will
have written to me with your letter, and
I am sure of it now! I will write you
and then in the letter!
Now a letter, and then, and then I want
another letter, and then, and then, and then
and then, and then, and then, and then, and then
of a letter, and then, and then, and then, and then
interest, and then, and then, and then, and then!

The play is full of intrigues; misunderstandings and mishaps play a large part in the action of this drama. The piece is stamped with a vividness of color and lifelike movement that are lacking in its predecessors. It has matchless dialogue in certain scenes; the satire is beautifully restrained and harmoniously blended; the personages come out of their shell and betray the master's hand in this delineation of character. Let us contrast the ambitious will of Stensgard to the wily-nily arrogance of Brand, or the figure of Bratsberg---that grave old-timer who has praises for the past and a prayer for the future---or with Skule, and we shall see how splendidly Ibsen has advanced in technique and skill.

PILLARS OF SOCIETY

This play marks a great advance upon the "League of Youth" in architectural symmetry of construction and in consistency of style. Ibsen has subordinated character to plot, here; from the first act to the last it is a model of good plot-development. It is the first of a series of "fifth-act" play in that all the crimes, misunderstandings and lies has occurred before the opening of the play. Consul Bernick, the pillar of society, had reached his state of respectability through a multitude of lies. The words that Lona Hessel, his sister-in-law, said to Bernick:

"I call it the lie----the threefold lie.

First the lie towards me; then the lie towards

Betty; then the lie towards John."¹

compromises the main thread of deceits upon which Bernick's good fortune has been built. In Youth, he had made love to Lona, his wife's (Betty) sister, and upon finding out that Betty was to receive the inheritance, turned his affections to her---leaving Lona in the role of the cast-off beloved. Also Bernick had pretended love for Betty while in reality he

sought only her money, and the last lie was the most dreadful one---for he had allowed John Hessel for fifteen years to suffer the blame of a deed which he himself had committed.....that of being involved in a sinful love-affair with a married woman.

Ibsen worked on Consul Bernick from a psychological standpoint. He heaped misfortune on him after the first act, and the more the Consul tried to plan and intrigue the more Ibsen thwarted him. For four acts Consul Bernick withstood the terror of a guilty conscience; the very fact that Lona Hessel came back, and straightened out the affairs of Bernick, and asked for no recompense stung his dormant sense of honor to the quick:

Bernick: "If it wasn't hatred or revenge, why
then did you come over from America
to me?"

Lona: "Old friendship does not rust."

Bernick: "Lona!"

Lona: "When John had told me of your lie,
I swore to myself: The hero of my
youth shall stand true and free."

Bernick: "Oh, how little have I deserved this
consideration from you?"

John Hessel's refusal to tattle on the Consul also made Bernick penitent. He began to realize just what sort of a cur he was after he had sent John and Dina Dorf to their doom on the fated "Indian Girl" ship; a ship in so poor condition that it would sink before it was a hundred miles out. His already bleeding conscience was completely unnerved when he received the news that his son, Olaf, had gone on the "Indian Girl" as a stowaway. The psychological moment comes when all the citizens, with music, torches, flags and banners, arrive at Bernick's house full of praise for him and for the work he has done for his community. Bernick can stand no more; he tells them the truth of his life---his lies, his deceptions, his sinful philandering and above all the frauds he has been guilty of under the pretense of a "good citizen."

His own family react like a light after the pressing of its electric connection; they gather about him and the old biblical idea that there is more rejoicing in Heaven over one repentant sinner than nine good men was put into action. Bernick becomes a new man in an hour's time and I could not help thinking, when I saw this transition in character, that Ibsen was following the old melodramatic idea of Dickens---

that favorite romantic author whose favorite device was the transformation of the villain into a model of virtue just before the end of the last chapter. It seems to me Ibsen mixed his ideas; he was trying to be a realist and by the use of psychological moments and a "guilty-conscience" he relapsed into a decided melodramatic state.

This play lacks interest because Ibsen has subordinated his characters. The women play the "deus ex machina" parts; but they show no signs of his later "women of revolt." Dina Dorf---the girl who has been subjected to much gossip---is perhaps the nearest to a Nora or a Helen. She tries to find a place for herself in life's busy streets. Lona Hessel and Martha Bernick represent the Ingeborg (The Pretenders) type of women who believe that woman's saga is to love, sacrifice everything, and in the end be forgotten. Lona Hessel's love for Bernick is romanticism with a vengeance---she had been to America, struggled through adversity, seen life from an entirely new angle, and yet she never outgrew her affection for Bernick. Martha Bernick's attachment for John Hessel, and her final beau geste in handing him over to the younger and beautiful Dina is the old antithesis of one man and two women which Ibsen was so fond of during his first period.

"Pillars of Society" was a tempest in a teapot, and Ibsen was resolved to clear this tempest up in the allotted three hours of stage-presentation. As yet there is no trace of that irreproachable objectivity to be found a few years hence in Ibsen's master dramas. He conceded to artistic idealism in this play; he gave the audience a repentant hero and he gave his audience this lesson---that society with its sham and lies should be wiped off the earth and that truth and freedom should take its place. Nevertheless, Ibsen is riding hard and fast to his glory---a glory that comes with his next play "The Doll's House"....where, instead of a happy ending, he gives his audience that famous scene of Nora's revolt with the banging of the door echoing throughout the theatre!

THE DOLL'S HOUSE

Torvald Helmer, the pillar of society in his community, is a model husband, father, and citizen. Ibsen paints Helmer with no dainty brush; he makes him Pharisaical---thanking God he is not as other men are---and egotistical. From the very first act where Torvald calls Nora, his wife, a "squirrel," a "sweet-tooth," a "song-bird" and his "lark," one realizes she is treated like a doll, not a wife. But the artist in Ibsen develops the character of Nora so that in the third act we find her the ultra-modern feminist; she has lost her doll-like traits, and becomes---in place of a faithful wife and a good mother---"herself."

The plot of this play revolves about Nora's forgery of her father's name and the consequent results when a shyster lawyer, Krogstad, uses his knowledge of her forgery to keep his place in the bank of which Helmer has been made manager. Ibsen has made Krogstad a despicable character whose motto is: "The end justifies the means." He has no conscience, and Nora's supplication to spare her husband the knowledge of her forgery (especially as it was done to obtain money enough with which she and her husband could go to Italy so the ailing Torvald might regain his health) does not stir his heart. The relentless

cruelty with which he meets her supplications is comparable only to Mephistopheles' attitude toward the dying Faustus who begs one more hour's reprieve; but both Krogstad and Mephistopheles are inflexible, saying---he who dances must pay the piper!

Torvald's resentment against Nora's act when he receives Krogstad's telltale note is summed up in horrible invectives, unjust accusations; and his final dictum that she can no longer play the part of Mother to his three children because her very presence would corrupt them. This scene where Torvald Helmer heaps accusations upon his wife is predominantly Ibsenite; the kind father, the indulgent husband, the pillar of society, the very essence of integrity turning his wife from him in wrath because she committed (childishly-ignorant of its significance) a forgery, in order that her husband might live, is ironic---the cream of a cruel jest! At first Nora, the loving, can not comprehend that Helmer is accusing her; her love for him was capable of everything, but his love for her was only a fair-weather love. The realization that Helmer would abandon her before sacrificing his own good-name shocked her sensibilities.

Helmer: "Well?"

Nora: "I firmly believed that you would come

...with which the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

forward, take everything upon yourself,
and say, "I am the guilty one."¹

The egotist Helmer could hardly grasp such an idea of self-sacrifice, let alone do it; Nora sees her true husband, and she sees that their marriage of eight years has been nothing but play---there was not a note of real harmony between them. In brief, Nora realizes that the man she married was not the man she thought she married; she had idealized Helmer and made him her God and it was a sad awakening to find that her God had the traditional feet of clay. What was there for her to do? All her life she had followed the line of least resistance and when Torvald Helmer failed her, she just "checked-out," to use a modern phrase. There is no doubt that the master dramatist played his trump card when Nora said 'good-bye' and sealed it with the reverberation of a heavy door closing behind her exit; the stage was silent and the atmosphere seemed to be dotted and dashed with question-marks, big and little.

It is in this play, "The Doll's House," that the poet's full originality and individuality is revealed. His immature Selma in "The League of Youth" develops into maturity overnight, as it were, and we find in Nora the beginning of Ibsen's great mission---that of emancipating women from the unjust

The next day, the weather was very good.

and we went to the park.

The children were very happy.

of the children, but they were not.

happy, and the other children were not.

and they were not happy.

happy, and the other children were not.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

and they were not happy.

tyranny of smug men.

The play shows a magnificent developing in both plot and characters; the Norwegian Seer has not missed an opportunity to enlarge upon Helmer's egotism, Rank's incapability, Nora's childishness, and Krogstad's villainy. The plot unravels itself throughout three acts of sparkling dialogue, swift action, and a powerful climax. How impossible, a few years back, would it have been for Ibsen to use the little tricks of ironic coincidence which makes "A Doll's House" so completely a modern drama! Remember "The Comedy of Love" and the characters of Falk and Svanhild who gave up their love before they had tasted it in order to keep their ideal and not have it shattered by the disillusionment of marriage! This problem was treated cautiously by Ibsen, but it lacked the magnetism, the fire, and the rushing conflicts of "A Doll's House." Ibsen had had the idea, then, but he had not attained the power of putting-across that idea to his audience. It was not until seventeen years later that he could develop his idea to such an extent that the world went fairly crazy with his message.

In "A Doll's House" Ibsen, like Nora, realized that all was not as he thought it to be and he, too, had his decision to make, and his own door to close---the door of

imitation and adherence to traditions. No longer was Ibsen going to be hoodwinked into the "happy ending;" instead he was going to become the ultra-realist--- the dramatist with a purpose. He scoffed at Aristotle's Cathartic Theory; his was no Utile Dulci theory as outlined by Horace---Ibsen had come out of his shell and had made now entirely new regulations. The dramatist's business was not to solve problems, but to ask questions, and these questions were to be answered by the audience. After this first dissipation, Ibsen went still further, and two years later he shocked the world into a state of moral indigestion by his "Ghosts"---a play developed from the character of Dr. Rank in "A Doll's House."

GHOSTS

Henrik Ibsen's "Ghosts" would be revolting to any normal, healthy-minded person who does not stop to consider the dramatist's purpose; but only see the revolting side of this seamy-drama. When this play was presented the newspaper-presses went wild; each paper took up the immorality of the play, its so-called degeneracy, and its loud crowing in public about subjects better kept in the cloister of one's own skeleton-closet. Here are some of the criticisms that hit Ibsen's genius a blow in its tenderest spot:

"Most loathsome of all Ibsen's plays....
garbage and offal."

TRUTH.

"Merely dull dirt long drawn out."

HAWK.

"Lugubrious diagnosis of sordid unpropriety...
characters are prigs, pedants and profligates."

BLACK & WHITE.

"Ibsen is a crazy fanatic...a crazy, cranky
being. Not only consistently dirty but deplorably
dull...."

TRUTH.¹

1. The Quintessence of Ibsenism: Ges. Bernard Shaw. Page 100

and these were the unkind criticisms that Henrik Ibsen received because he was trying to show the world that lying and debauchery lead only to disaster and eventual ruin.

It has been said that "Ghosts" might have been a sequel to "A Doll's House" on the basis that the poet was attempting to show the world what would have happened if Nora had stayed with Torvald; but this basis seems weak because Helmer was not a profligate or dissipated in the sense that Chamberlain Alving was---he was just a smug, conceited philistine too stupid to sin. It seems more probable to me that Ibsen again thumbed over old manuscripts and hit upon the character of Dr. Rank. (A Doll's House.) There is one scene especially that links up with a later scene in "Ghosts."

Nora: ".....be in good humour, doctor."

Rank: "With death staring me in the face?-and to suffer thus for another's sin! Where's the justice of it? And in one way or another you can trace in every family some such inexorable retribution."

Nora: "Nonsense, nonsense! Now do cheer up!

Rank: "Well, I suppose so, after all, the whole thing's only worth laughing at. My poor

innocent spine must do penance for my
father's wild oats!"¹

Now, connect this scene up with a scene in "Ghosts,"
written two years later.

Oswald: "The Paris doctor said, "The sins of
the fathers are visited upon the children."

Mrs. Alving: "The sins of the fathers---!"²

Does it not seem plausible that Dr. Rank was an Oswald in
the embryo? That the artist in Ibsen saw a chance for a
good drama if he developed Dr. Rank....just as he saw a
Selma (League of Youth) developed into a Nora? (A Doll's
House.)

It is a remarkable thing that in this year of 1881---
what seems to us the dark ages now---Henrik Ibsen's mental
abilities were so developed that he could see into another
century and give us pre-modern ideas on a thoroughly twen-
tieth century subject. The subtle way that Ibsen lead up
to the catastrophe of the burning orphanage was simple
genius; one could feel that such an enterprise had only
failure to look forward to, being based upon such deceit
and nastiness. Helen Alving represented the typical wife

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume 7
Page 82.

2. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume 8
Page 247

Important points must be remembered for the

Teacher's work being:

1. To present this course as a whole in "The Plan."

2. To present the course later.

3. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

4. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

5. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

6. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

7. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

8. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

9. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

10. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

11. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

12. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

13. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

14. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

15. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

16. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

17. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

18. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

19. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

20. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

21. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

22. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

23. To present the course as a whole in "The Plan."

and mother (even in our own modern days, too) who would sacrifice her life to save her dissolute husband's name. No matter how bad a man may be his wife will always keep his good-side to the public when that man can show a pretense of wealth and influence to the community. It is only human-nature to shield the sins of our kin; but Ibsen wants to do away with this sham; he wants wives to realize that they have their own lives to live and that to shield the dissolute lives of polygamous husbands will only ruin them and the lives of their children.

The pitiful portrayal of Oswald carries over a deep lesson; we all know to suffer sickness from our own carelessness is sad enough---but to suffer such a dreadful disease as Oswald's because his father laughed at the Sixth Commandment is nothing short of tragedy! When we leave him in the final scene crying for "The sun, the sun" we feel the intensity of his sickness and we realize that when hereditary lays its skeleton hand upon us we enter the struggle for existence with the ineradicable taint of hereditary weakness gnawing like a vulture at our very vitals.¹

1. European Dramatists: Archibald Henderson.

and further down in our own history, for the world
 yesterday has been a very different place from
 the world that we live in today. It is always

the case with the world, and it is always
 the case with the world, and it is always
 the case with the world, and it is always
 the case with the world, and it is always
 the case with the world, and it is always
 the case with the world, and it is always
 the case with the world, and it is always

The world is always the same, and it is always

the same, and it is always the same, and it is always

the same, and it is always the same, and it is always

the same, and it is always the same, and it is always

the same, and it is always the same, and it is always

the same, and it is always the same, and it is always

the same, and it is always the same, and it is always

the same, and it is always the same, and it is always

the same, and it is always the same, and it is always

the same, and it is always the same, and it is always

the same.

1. The world is always the same, and it is always

This play "Ghosts" stamps Ibsen as the modern dramatist; it ranks with other epoch-making plays of the later nineteenth century, such as "Hernani" and "La Dame aux Camélias." Ibsen is essentially original; George Brandes¹ describes "Ghosts" as the poet's noblest deed, and declares that it marks Ibsen's final breach with his early romanticism, saying that it is his imperishable glory, and will give lasting life to his works.

1. Henrik Ibsen: Critical Studies. George Brandes.

AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE

Henrik Ibsen was stirred to immediate action after reading the criticisms of "Ghosts;" he realized more than ever the pusillanimity, the moral obtuseness, and the rat-like greed and cunning which the narrow-minded citizen exhibits; and he was through playing with them. He showed his claws in this play that followed "Ghosts" within a year, "An Enemy of the People." As we have seen, each of Ibsen's plays chronicles his soul life during a certain period; each bears a certain relationship to its predecessors and its successors, and frequently owes its origin to some idea prompted by the former, and engenders the parent through which the latter springs.¹

Dr. Thomas Stockmann is the mouthpiece of Ibsen, and many of the ideas that Ibsen has spoken of in his earlier days are put verbatim in Stockmann's mouth. Ibsen recognized the fact that people were deriding him in parlors, cafes, and teas; he knew that "Ghosts" had caused his alienation from the world, yet he did not care---it only proved his old rule more correct, that the minority is ever right.

Dr. Stockmann is a man who is for the people's good,

1. Commentary on The Writings of Henrik Ibsen: H. W. Boyesen.
Page 233.

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

and when he finds that the Baths are contaminated he goes right about correcting them; it was his brother, Peter, the Mayor, who fights Stockmann and says that if he advertises that the Baths, instead of curing sick people, will kill them, that he will ruin his own community. Stockmann can hardly believe that his own brother would be guilty of murder rather than lose money, and he becomes indignant and proposes to tell the world at large of the corrupt Baths and suffer the consequences. The Mayor gets the majority to back him in stopping Stockmann's plan, and at the end of the third act Stockmann stands alone---he and his family an outcast from society---and the doctor dubbed an "enemy of society."

The third act is completely Ibsenite. The assembly of town-folk meet and every word that Stockmann tries to utter is drowned by fish-horns, hisses and yells. But withal the doctor manages to say a few words, and now comes a tremendous arraignment of democracy which springs from the heart of the Poet:

"The most dangerous foes of truth and liberty among us is the compact majority...The majority never have the right on their side. Never,

I say.....but the minority is always right."¹

The last act in this play proves Ibsen's most favorite doctrine. Dr. Stockmann stands alone; he must leave his house; he has lost his position as doctor at the Baths; his daughter, Petra, forfeits her right to teach in the community schoolhouse; his two young boys are requested to leave the school, and his wife is deprived of the society of her friends. Yet it is here that Dr. Stockmann finds himself! He is emancipated from his restraint....that of playing henchman to his brother, the Mayor, and he feels, although the community at large points accusing fingers at him and his family, that he is pure, strong and free to do his mission in life. It is in this sense that the doctor delivers that never-to-be-forgotten statement: "The strongest man in the world is he who stands alone".....a truly Ibsenite doctrine.

This play has many merits; but one thing it lacks is a love episode. The master, Ibsen, has subordinated everything in this play save Stockmann, until it becomes at times an animated debate. The play manifests Ibsen's remarkable talent for delineation of character, and the darts of his satire seem to hold more poison than ever as they fly from

his bow into the hearts of his enemies. One place, especially, brings out this idea:

Stockmann: "But now I'll show something...

I'll sharpen my pen against them
till it becomes a goad; I'll dip
it in gall and venom; I'll hurl
my inkstand straight at their
skulls."¹

After Ibsen has finished this play he seems to be satisfied that he has gained much ground; Archer² tells us that Ibsen made the statement that "at all events, I am conscious of my incessant progression....always getting further ahead." This is absolutely true---from the "Feast at Solhaug" down to "An Enemy of The People" Ibsen's advance is made to the tune of a jolly march. But this intellectual advance does not continue down to "John Gabriel Borkman;" to the psychological series that begin with "Rosmersholm," this advance hardly applies---he does not exactly stand still, but during his last period Ibsen's intellectual evolution lets up, and a more deepening spiritual insight takes its place. During this second period indignation has been the Mother of Ibsen's philosophy---but this Mother-indignation grows into a

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume VIII, Page 182.

2. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer, Volume VIII, Page 12.

the first of the series of his master, the first

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

of the series, the first of the series

more gentle and a more subdued Mother-pathos during his third and last period.

These results are a good example of the - power of the

the - and the -

THE WILD DUCK

The mood in which Ibsen wrote this play was one of deepest despair. He seems to have arrived at the conclusion that no one can remake human nature; one can never change man; and that he, with his preaching of his "ideal demand" and "truth and freedom," was probably the greatest mischief-maker in the world. The protagonist, Gregers Werle, is undoubtedly a satire of the Poet's own nature; Greger's habit of bothering people with the claim of the ideal is analagous to Ibsen's own conduct.

"The Wild Duck" is a distinctly reactionary play; the Norwegian Seer had spent a quarter of his life trying to eliminate sham and lies from society, and now, here he is, admitting that man must have a life-illusion in order to live. In brief, shatter man's life-lie, and shatter his whole world. He proved this point by having Gregers Werle enter the house of Hjalmar Ekdal and in a short time disrupt the apparent harmony of his home. Gregers knows that Hjalmar's wife, Gina, has been Mr. Werle's (Greger's father) mistress, and that the little girl, Hedvig, is not really Ekdal's child; Gregers holds to the "claim of the ideal" and believes it is his mission in life to correct the lie upon which Gina and Hjalmar's marriage is based. The complete sans-gene attitude of

Gregers who believes that the truth will straighten out matters is nothing short of idiocy; he blurts out the truth and the life-illusion of the dreamer, Hjalmar, is destroyed. The outcome is disastrous---Hjalmar swears to leave his wife and break up the home, and the child, Hedvig, conscious that it is she who has caused the trouble, goes up to the garret to kill her dearest treasure, the wild duck, and then to kill herself in order to prove her love for her father, Hjalmar.

This child-character, Hedvig, is most delicately drawn, and appeals to our sympathy. Her eyes, which are going to become blind, make a strong appeal to us who realize that the child's few pleasures will be soon taken away. Her ardent devotion to the pretended-genius, Hjalmar, is beautiful in its childish credulity and faith. One receives a violent shock when the body of the dead child is presented to the audience; that final scene is so shockingly grotesque that the onlooker must be steeled with an Aristophanic sense of the comic in order not to succumb to the ghastly aspect of the performance.¹

The whole play is the exposing of the truth-fanatic who bungles everyone's life in trying to find the "claims of

1. The New Ibsen: Otto Weigand.

the ideal." Gregers Werle is in direct opposition to Relling, that blunt creature who has more sense than anyone in the house. Relling does not wear rose-colored glasses; he sees human nature as it is, and Hjalmar, that first-rate virtuoso of old-time melodrama, can not fool him with "pretended-genius" and "scientific mind." At the very end of the play Relling tells Gregers:¹

Relling: "Before a year is over, little Hedvig will be nothing to him but a petty theme for declamation....you'll hear him spouting about "the child too early torn from her father's heart;" Then you'll see him steep himself in a syrup of sentiment and self-admiration and self-pity. Just you wait!"

Gregers: "If you are right, and I am wrong, then life is not worth living."

Relling: "Oh, life would be quite tolerable, after all, if only we could be rid of the confounded duns that keep on pestering us, in our poverty, with the claim of the ideal."

Relling's very phrases carry a keen sense of humor and also a bit of pathos; but he is too much the realist to parley with ideals. Ibsen, himself, stands midway between the two characters; he is both a Relling and a Gregers---each one vying with the other for supremacy.

"The Wild Duck" plays a great part in Ibsen's intellectual evolution; the drama marks the summit of the artist's achievements in modern prose up to now. Ibsen¹ said that he hoped "The Wild Duck" might perhaps lure some of the younger dramatists into new paths; this might be---but the true value of this play lies in the fact that it marks the transition from realism to symbolism---this symbolism being predominate throughout the whole of his third and last period---numbering seven plays in all.

1. Correspondence: Letters to Hegel. September 2, 1885.

C. CRITICAL EVALUATION OF HIS SECOND
PERIOD OF DEVELOPMENT

We have just finished discussing Ibsen's second period, and we shall now take a small resume of it. Ibsen's youthful life was sordid; he was poor; he was undernourished; he saw sham and lies conquering truth and honesty; he saw the power of money brandish its raw stick tyrannically over the heads of the poor; he felt keenly the anguish of being outside the pale of aristocracy, and not being able to enter the domain of the blue-bloods. With all this in mind is it any wonder then that he bitterly attacked life from every conceivable point? Is it any mystery, then, that he used cutting words in addressing the Philistine erotic; that he was profoundly distrustful of the sustaining power of love throughout the changes of a life time; that he felt every strong man in the community to be a swindler of the less powerful? No, indeed, Henrik Ibsen "saw life steadily and saw it whole;" he was not going to be misled by the tawny tinsel of an ephemeral festival.

To Ibsen his country, Norway, was the abode of pettiness, apathy, and faint-heartedness, and in later life Norway became so hateful to him that he turned his back on it completely. Ever since 1864 Ibsen has never had a home; he has travelled through such countries as Italy, Dresden and Munich, but never

has he regarded himself as being "at home."

This fact of his separation from his people bears great weight in discussing his second period, for it shows that Ibsen became what his later plays exemplify---a solitary man who walked alone in his greatness. He became grim---taciturn beyond all imagination, and settled himself with pen and paper, planning to forget the world that had shown only its claws to him. He had sought beauty for beauty's sake, and because at so immature an age as twenty-six he had never found his treasure, he took solace in unveiling the sad truths of life that lies behind glamorous appearances.

The first play of his second period "The League of Youth" deals with the rise and progress of one Stensgard. It is in this character that Ibsen vents all his vermin against political cesspools. Stensgard is a vulgar proletariat; but he is ambitious to gain a political foothold, regardless of the means used to attain his ends.

Ibsen is more or less side-tracked in this play from his usual task, because here he seems to admit that party mobs are always headed by a Stensgard, and that there is "no use talking-" to employ a common expression. Ibsen illustrates his hatred of parties later in "An Enemy of the People" when Dr. Stockmann says:

"A party is like a sausage machine; it grinds all the heads together in one smash."¹

This play "The League of Youth" is very forceful; it would play well in an open theatre where the stage was a number of soapboxes, and each character could play his role like some hot-blooded politician. But this play was only a suggestion of what was to come, later, in "An Enemy of the People." "The League of Youth" started Ibsen thinking on the sordid side of community politics and the contemptible workings of its small-town political machine.

Ibsen's next play is an invective against sham and lies. "The Pillars of Society" is a drama that enhances Ibsen; it is essentially an Ibsen-play; it is marked by all his extravagances; it tears the very atmosphere with its awfulness; it routs like some terrible monster against life's vicissitudes. In "The Pillars of Society" Ibsen pours delicious irony on those conventional lies which are regarded as the foundations of social and domestic life. Consul Bernick is a rich ship-owner and a very pillar of society; the whole town bows acquiescence to his command. The play revolves around narrow-minded Philistinism, and the petty village souls feed on scandals as crows on carrion; it is their greatest pleasure to render defenseless reputation to shreds. As I read this play I hardly

knew whether he was laughing at life or crying for life! The sudden confession of Consul Bernick at the end of the play entirely decomposed me; I felt Ibsen was about to portray another shamed Judas, who skulks away in the shadows of his own prison. Instead he aroused my very sense of justice by allowing Bernick's humility to win the people's pity.

I myself can not allow for such a change of character in so short a time as one hour; Bernick had been sinning for years, how could he find the straight and narrow path by the flicker of an eyelash, and how could his change of heart be motivated by anything but cowardice!

Ibsen completely turns the villain into a model of virtue; Bernick does a moral somersault and lands into the loving arms of his forgiving family. Ibsen who is usually so scrupulous in his adherence to reality seems to forget, for a moment, truth and lapses into a semi-conscious state of theatrical effectiveness.....and he gives his audience what they want.....the transformed rake who now sits amid his family circle as the prodigal son---while the servants kill the fatted calf.

As I proceed to take up the next play of Ibsen's second period, I become humble at the thoughts of evaluating such a masterpiece. "A Doll's House" caused much stir at one time; it was denounced, but now "A Doll's House" holds an eminent

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

The hospital was at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

When I was in the hospital at the end of the war.

place among the dramas of the world. The play contains Ibsen's most elaborate portrait of a woman, and it is his chief contribution to the elucidation of the questions relating to the social functions and positions of women in the modern world.¹ The play is a tragedy of marriage; but Ibsen has so closely knit the knots of the tragedy that the play seems all end and no beginning. Nora is adorable; she does outrageous things, but withal we can condone her actions because her husband, Torvald Helmer, treats her like a precious toy instead of a person having common-sense. I can hear you say Nora had no common-sense or she would not have flirted to attain her ends, or borrowed money by forging her father's name, or lie so glibly---while I admit she did do "naughty" things, much like an untutored yet inherently good child---Nora Helmer showed great sense in leaving Torvald, for what was he more than a narrow-minded plebian who could only shout at his wife:

"No man sacrifices his honor even for the one he loves."²

A modern way of saying:

1. The New Spirit: Havelock Ellis. Page 160

2. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume VII
Page 148.

"I could not love thee, dear, so much loved I
not honor more."

Beginning with Nora, working through Mrs. Alving, Rebecca, Hedda Gabler, and others, Ibsen emancipated the women from their bondage of subservience to the male species. Men have held the throne long enough, let them become the spectators now, while the down-trodden women make their debut, and fling aside their cloak of reticence. Nora is the first suffragette---and she is followed by an army who break through the conventional barriers and shout, with joyous voice, and in one accord---"We've arrived, let those who will---follow."

In "Ghosts" Ibsen has reached his highest point of art. His characters are common place; his scenes are everyday---in fact we see only the library of Mrs. Alving's home---the dialogue is simple; but the play carries a tragic intensity that seers our very soul.

No matter how many times I read over that last scene of "Ghosts," and read the dialogue between the mother and son, and read his last cries: "The sun, the sun," I feel smothered. I experience a shudder of horror at the grotesque ending, and I always recall Shelley's "Cenci", with the calm Beatrice fixing her hair in preparation for her death. The "Cenci" was full of insanity; Shelley made you recoil in disgust from the

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

and then there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

"I would not have been here, I would have been there."

grotesque scenes just as Ibsen's final scene in "Ghosts" scrapes the very marrow of your sensibilities. Both the Cenci and Oswald are only victims of their environment, but that does not lessen any the horror and ghastliness of both characters.

"Ghosts" left the audience in a turmoil. Would Mrs. Alving kill her son---would she keep her promise, and give him the tablets? Or would she---mother-love conquering---keep him alive although life for him would mean only endless misery. Well, Ibsen did not concern himself with the answer; his mission was to question, and let the audience solve the problem.

This play marks Ibsen as a modern dramatist; had he gone no further in his dramatic-writing, I am convinced that his fame would have been established with the production of "Ghosts," and he would have been proclaimed as one of the leading dramatists of his day.

His next play, "An Enemy of The People," was written in a very uncheerful mood, for Ibsen was venting his rage on the people who had spitefully received his "Ghosts." For this reason, Ibsen is at his best; revenge is guiding his pen and the result is that "An Enemy of the People" is one of his keenest and wittiest works. Although Ibsen keeps Dr. Stockmann

proceeding against the people of the State.

There is no very serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

There is no serious danger to the people.

distinct from himself, he does not lose a chance to make this courageous physician his own mouthpiece.

The play is important in that it brings forth the poet's essentially aristocratic principles for the first time; for never before had Ibsen so forcibly preached the doctrine that grave error is always to be found among the majority. Here he exemplified his life's doctrine: "The strongest man in the world is he who stands alone."

Dr. Stockmann is one of the most likable of Ibsen's characters. We see his moral earnestness as opposed to the thieving immorality of the day. He is a simple character whose every simplicity stamps him as a man among men; it is through the doctor's own feeling of futility that we come to regard him as great---he knows his head is hitting the inevitable stone wall; but for the sake of justice he keeps hammering away with a vengeance! What a splendid man! How our corrupted present-day politics need the guiding-hand of a competent Stockmann! How quickly the world would succumb to political cleanliness if only a Stockmann could rule it with an unyielding hand!

In this play, as his others, Ibsen ends the scene with dramatic forcefulness; he shows his time-worn theory that the right is always the minority, and the wrong is the majority, and I think the fourth act in the play is one of the most

powerful and genuinely dramatic acts that Ibsen ever wrote.

"The Wild Duck" is, perhaps, Ibsen's most pessimistic play; but certainly a remarkable one. I regard this play as a definite marked advancement in his art. He curls his heart around that pathetically lovable and noblehearted little girl---Hedvig, and gives us, for once, a glimpse into his other self which shows itself to be kind-hearted and genial. In this play Ibsen forgets the tricks of his trade, and perches himself in open-view of his public.

This work is also important because we can trace an after-effect of the maltreatment that was Ibsen's recompense for "Ghosts" in the character of Gregers Werle who is a caricature of the man who insists on bearing witness for the truth.

Let us compare this play, "The Wild Duck," to "The Pillars of Society." In the latter play we have the melodramatic ending where the rake becomes the saint; a ship is rescued so as to prevent disaster, and the ugly becomes the good; but in "The Wild Duck" we have the bitter reality of life; the full austerity together with the full suavity of art.¹

"The Wild Duck" presents Ibsen in a different mood, and thus it leaves us with a sense of topsy-turviness. Weigand² has referred to it as a madhouse play, and I am convinced to believe

1. Henrik Ibsen: George Brandes. Page 24.

2. The New Ibsen: Otto Weigand.

him. Taken as a whole, it appears first to be a splendid play for mad people to enjoy; but when dissected and analyzed it takes a form, and it begins eventually to mean something.

"The Wild Duck" discusses the moral aspects of the equality of the sexes. Is a woman, who has had no relationships with a man before marriage, entitled to expect the same from her husband? Is a man, who has had relationships with other women before marriage, entitled to complain if his wife has also had such relationships? Ibsen seems to solve this sex equality question by saying that there can be no true marriage without mutual knowledge and mutual confession.

Ibsen's real claim to honor in this play is that he seems to have lived through every experience that he writes about. It is not the disconnected ramblings of an imaginative holiday; but while he depicts scene after scene, he clings tenaciously to the theme---"the ideal demand." Ibsen sums up the moral of this play in the words of the cynical Dr. Relling:¹

"Oh, life might yet be quite tolerable, if we were only left in peace by those blessed duns who are continually knocking at the door of us poor folk with their 'ideal demand.'"

Thus Ibsen finished his Second Period. He first stood waist deep in the romantic state;² but by a slow process worked

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume VIII
Page 400.

2. Henrik Ibsen: George Brandes. Page 79.

himself out of it until he stood, safe and dry, on the shores of realism. This Second Period marks an epoch in Ibsen's life for two reasons:

(1) It caused him to be recognized by the world as an eminent dramatist.

(2) He tosses traditions to the winds and makes needed renovations in the dramatic world. As Ibsen stands ready to enter the Third and last Period of his life's work, we can only stand back and pay tribute to so great a mind--- a genius ever-developing!

himself out of it and he knows, but he says, "Oh, no!"
 answer of reason. And the whole matter is shown in

John's life for two reasons:

(1) It shows him to be controlled by the world

as an external force.

(2) It shows that even to the mind and heart

which is working in the physical world, is there a

way to enter the world and feel it as it is.

We can only stand back and say "What a pity!"

a sense of helplessness!

ROSMERSHOLM

In "Rosmersholm," the play with which Ibsen followed up "The Wild Duck," there is a marked change in his technique. Ibsen seems to try to follow up the idea of his social-dramas, but becomes so intensely interested in the two leading characters, Rosmer and Rebecca, that he transforms it into a psychological play based on individual differences.

The theme of the play is simple; the credulous husband, the self-sacrificing wife, (who is dead when the play opens) and the wily woman who employs arts and intrigues to gain a foothold in his home. The play is a fine example of the retrospective method used in "Odipus Rex," for in the first act the deeds leading to the catastrophe are done, and all Ibsen needs is a few more scenes with which to set off the bomb.

As I look back on Ibsen's earlier plays, and try to find any foundation upon which he based "Rosmersholm," I came upon this clue:

At the end of "An Enemy of the People," Ibsen leaves Dr. Stockmann an emancipated man. He was to become a "free" man, in every sense of the word; but the character of Rosmer takes on this "free" attitude at the very beginning of "Rosmersholm." In brief, he picks up Stockmann's thread, and he is going to free his community from the shackles of lying conventions. As

THE PLAYERS

In "The Players" the play with which I have followed up "The Willows" there is a marked change in his technique. I have known to try to follow the lead of the original, but because of technical interest in the new I have attempted, rather than to follow, to lead. The new I have attempted, rather than to follow, to lead. The new I have attempted, rather than to follow, to lead.

The theme of the play is simple; the creative process is well-satisfied with, I have known to try to follow the lead of the original, but because of technical interest in the new I have attempted, rather than to follow, to lead. The new I have attempted, rather than to follow, to lead.

As I look back on I have known to try to follow the lead of the original, but because of technical interest in the new I have attempted, rather than to follow, to lead. The new I have attempted, rather than to follow, to lead.

At the end of "The Players" I have known to try to follow the lead of the original, but because of technical interest in the new I have attempted, rather than to follow, to lead. The new I have attempted, rather than to follow, to lead.

soon as Kroll, that weak-minded school-master, learns of Rosmer's transition from a conservative man to one who holds the most radical of views, he begins a violent attack upon Rosmer's intellectual emancipation. Rosmer has to be subjected to community gossip and spiteful attack just as Stockmann did; he is insulted in every way and the papers hinted that such free thinking ideas could not be such a distance from free-living.

Rebecca is the impelling force in this play. When she makes her confession that she deliberately set out with the intention of causing Beata (Rosmer's wife) to commit suicide, we are not surprised. Naturally a girl who is an illegitimate child and who was brought up by a free-thinking father who claimed no connection with the moral or the good, could not be expected to be otherwise than degenerate. Her later confession of a discreditable episode with some man does not surprise us, either. Ibsen makes Rebecca a psychological study of an individual who has been destroyed by environment; she is a Hjordis less violent, but more mature. Rebecca West is a Nora Helmer, developed to the point of depravity, and she is the first of Ibsen's line of women who might be termed "devastatingly individual."

The relationship between Rosmer and Rebecca is strained by the fact that neither has the courage of his or her own conviction; Rebecca fixed the stage for herself, but when Rosmer fell into the net and proposed marriage to her, she lost

her nerve and refused. Rosmer is just the pathetic portrayal of a man who is easily led on; he makes no impression until the end of the drama where he insists that he will follow Rebecca into the mill-race if she will go first.

The final scene in this play is breath-taking; it seems incredible that Rebecca West is going to atone for her sins by throwing her body in the mill-race. I awaited Ibsen's master-hand to turn the drama quickly from all-tragedy to half-tragedy; to avert Rebecca's death and to have Rosmer's faith in her renewed. It was appalling to believe that the two would cast themselves away, yet they do; into the dark night the two go, hand in hand, mount the bridge, and embracing each other, leap into the cataract.

In this play, "Rosmersholm," Ibsen has penetrated more deeply into the soil of human conscience than in any other works. I felt that he was trying to eliminate social pressure and give his audience a clear vision of human-beings who live, laugh, love and die; who suffer the vilest tortures; who commit the gravest sins---yet withal are brave and fine enough to confess and to atone.

THE LADY FROM THE SEA

"The Lady from the Sea" is the first play of Ibsen's which is devoted entirely to pure psychology; this fact probably accounts for the many weaknesses found in the drama. The piece is decidedly devoid of artistic-greatness, and the characters seem less "Ibsenite" than usual; it seems to play an intermediate part in Ibsen's development, for its immediate predecessors, "The Wild Duck" and "Rosmersholm," and its immediate successors, "Hedda Gabler" and "The Master Builder" are masterpieces, while "The Lady from the Sea" falls below in technique and in intellectual force.

Archer¹ says that at first Ibsen intended Wangel to be a lawyer; but his natural antipathy to legal-minded men (Stensgard, Helmer, Krogstad, Brack) made him alter his plans and give the medical profession to the character of Wangel. All Ibsen's doctors are sympathetic, kindly creatures (Rank, Stockmann, Relling, Fieldbo) as opposed to the mercenary men called lawyers.

Ellida is one of Ibsen's rarest women characters; she has married Dr. Mangel and never once attempted to become mother to his two children, Boletta and Hilda, born out of his first marriage. When Ellida comes upon the stage, she wears a cloak over her bathing attire and her hair is down;

1. William Archer: Preface to "Lady from the Sea". Page 23.

THE LATE FROM THE SEA

"The late from the sea" is the first play by

Shaw's which is devoted entirely to pure romance; this

fact is itself suggestive for the many resemblances found in the

work. The theme is basically that of the "lost" and the

and the characters are "lost" and "found" in the same way; it is

in this sense that the play is Shaw's "romance" and the

theme is pure romance. The "lost" and "found" are

and the characters are "lost" and "found" in the same way; it is

"lost" and "found" in the same way; it is "lost" and "found" in the

same way; it is "lost" and "found" in the same way; it is

Another example of Shaw's "lost" and "found" is the

same; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

same way; but the "lost" and "found" are "lost" and "found" in the

immediately one feels that Ibsen is trying to bring out his idea of "The Lady from the Sea" with no deviation. All through this play, Ibsen keeps up this sea-motif, in one part Dr. Wangel says:

"Have you not noticed who live out by the open sea are like a race apart? They seem almost to live the life of the sea itself."¹

This is especially true of Ellida---all her life has been spent by the sea, and the doctor feels he has committed a grave error in removing her from her natural element.

Ellida tells Wangel that she can no longer live as his wife, and she tells him of a romantic love-affair years ago with a disreputable sailor. This sailor has become a terror to her; she is afraid of his return because she will go off with him if she once sees him again. Wangel realizes the mental condition of his wife, and tries to soothe her; in the meantime an English ship enters port and on it is the "Stranger." When the Stranger demands Ellida the doctor becomes angry, and it is only the feeling that Ellida might love this man which keeps him from handing him over to the authorities.

The climax is reached when Wangel, realizing his inability to hold his wife against the power of this Stranger, tells her that she is free to go to him; free to choose, and all on her own responsibility. That last phrase captures Ellida's fancy.

Ellida: "In freedom, Wangel, and on my own responsibility? Responsibility!

This---this transforms everything."¹

She has no choice to make, now. She accepts Wangel's offer, and goes back to his home, "on her own responsibility."

The symbolic meaning of this story is this:

Ibsen wanted to show that every human soul, before it resigns itself to discipline, must feel the wild allurements of an uncivilized freedom. Ellida's was a psychological rebellion; she felt some inner power pulling her against her will, and the fantastic idea of such a weird situation enticed her on. It was Wangel, the good-natured, altruistic doctor, who saved her from ruin by seeing just what she needed; he recognized her restlessness under restraint, and forthwith gave her complete freedom.

The last scene shows that Ibsen believes in the theory of "duty;" Ellida is now at home, and she begins to assume responsibilities that she had hitherto left to her eldest step-daughter. She is cured of her strange disease, and endeavors to perform her wifely duties with genuine pleasure.

In this play, Ibsen has, for the first time, dealt with the occult; but it is a mere scratching of a surface, and I felt that his whole attitude toward Ellida's fascination for

William: "In the past, I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

The man who spoke to him, now, the man who spoke to him, now.

the man who spoke to him, now, the man who spoke to him, now.

the man who spoke to him, now, the man who spoke to him, now.

These words to him, these words to him, these words to him.

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

The man who spoke to him, now, the man who spoke to him, now.

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

1. Continued: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

William: "I have been told that you are a very good person."

the Stranger was one of gentle satire---that her imagination was set-on fire by the romantic image of a man long absent, and that dissatisfaction would be the outcome when the Stranger returned. In brief, Ibsen's play could be summed up in a line taken from Shelley's "To a Skylark":

"We look before and after; we pine for what is not."

The University was one of the first to establish
 was set up in 1862 at the University of the South
 and that the University could be the source of the
 University of the South. In 1862, the University of the South
 was set up in 1862 at the University of the South
 was set up in 1862 at the University of the South

HEDDA GABLER

The amazing quality of "Hedda Gabler" is emphasized by the fact that its predecessor, "Lady from the Sea" was so poor:-"The Lady from the Sea" was Ibsen taking a casual saunter down the blind alleys of thought and "Hedda Gabler" was the after-effect of this digression. The suppression of his genius in "The Lady from the Sea" might be compared to the theory of marginal utility---Ibsen had gone on with a remarkable development---each drama he wrote was superlative to the last, and suddenly he found he could not digest any more dramas---in other words, "Rosmersholm" finished him for a while; he had had enough, just as a small boy has had sufficient chocolates after he has consumed a two pound box. But wait a while! Give the small boy a chance to recover, and he will eat as many bon-bons again. So it was with Ibsen; he needed a rest from over consumption and he found this rest in writing "The Lady from the Sea." "Hedda Gabler" was a returning to normalcy, and what a striking come-back!

"Hedda Gabler" might be traced back as far as Hjordis of "The Vikings at Helgeland." Hjordis was that ferocious type of woman who had no appeal; she was devilish and a most repellent and obnoxious female for man to think upon. Like Hjordis, Hedda was a fierce agitator who incited men to rash

THE GARDEN

The garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

garden of the "Garden" is the

deeds by her cunning phrases and saccharine voice. But Hedda was more nearly matched a Nora or a Helen in that Hedda was supposed to be a modern aristocrat. Hedda revelled in playing with fire; but she must first be assured that there would not be any danger of getting burnt. In one scene Brack says:¹

"An orgie---followed by the customary free fight with resultant ejection. Then a street row outside. Windows smashed. Police called...then the lock-up."

Hedda: "It would be curious to be present at such a scene."

Brack: "Would you like to be, Mrs. Hedda?"

Hedda: "Oh yes, once in a way. If no one saw me and nobody heard anything of it afterwards."

Can not you just picture the smug complaisance of her, and the "easiest way is the best" idea which so closely resembles Molière's Tartuffe who said-".....and secret sinning isn't sin at all." Oh, the wretched lives that some people live when they pride themselves and call themselves upright citizens instead of admitting that they are sacrimonious blackguards who kiss God's altar while they steal from His Sanctuary. Pretended "God's chosen" who are only reminiscent of the money changers in the Temple!

Such is Hedda Gabler; she flirts with any man up to a point where it becomes dangerous; she would stoop to any crime to obtain the gratification of her desires; she would marry a man for mercenary reasons and then refuse to have conjugal

relations with him, and then she would preen her feathers, show a steel-ly, fixed smile, and sigh: "Oh, I'm so virtuous!"

Hedda takes Helen Alving's ideas without any of Mrs. Alving's heart; and she advocates Nora's emancipation without any of Nora's scruples and necessary good sense.

She is a woman devoid of sensibilities and her insatiable desire for superiority makes her hunger for any new sensation that might call forth praises from the onlookers. Take for instance, the scene where she burns Lovborg's manuscript, and then has the utter audacity to tell Tesman, her husband, that she did it for love of him, that she could not bear to think of Lovborg ever proving his mental superiority over her own, dear husband. Hedda's irony contains the prescribed venom, and Ibsen drives home more than ever the fact that one might tell you how charming you were, yet mentally he could be thinking you the worst of fops: to use Shakespeare's phrase "There's daggers in men's smiles." Never trust the surface.....a lesson that the Norwegian Seer has ever been trying to teach!

Nora and Helen Alving lead the way for Hedda when they denied their interest in old traditions; but it was Hedda who really made the first complete dash across the desert of Revolt. It is she who would say the "dam it all" that Nora feverishly

...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same

...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same

...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same

...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same

...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same

...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same

...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same

...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same
...and the world was not the same

wished to say, and it is she who would strike the match to the cigarette that Nora or Helen might dare only to insert in their mouth. It is only this spirit of hers that saves her from falling into the filthy state of degeneracy to which she rightly belongs, and manages to classify her in the list "A" of Ibsen's women.

Tesman plays the part of the stupid husband, and develops from a Torvald Helmer or even a suave Consul Bernick, though it is true Tesman's only sin is his exalted opinion of "the aunties"-a sin easy enough to forgive when one considers his upbringing. The lover, Lovborg, is the sinner who repents only to sin some more; Ibsen seems to use him only for a minor part, a cog in the machinery that is to grind out Hedda's future ruin; Thea Elvsted is his paramour, a bit of "sweetness and light" who has inspired the degenerate, Lovborg, on to great ambitions, and her love for him is the simple, devotional kind of love exemplified by a Dagny or a Margaret.

The suicide of Hedda comes with a surprise, for although she is in the clutches of Judge Brack, owing to the fact that he recognizes her gun as being the revolver that innocently enough (but compromising enough) caused Lovborg's end, yet her death is unwarranted. Surely a woman so destitute of morality would not mind becoming Brack's mistress. Hedda had been the cause of three tragic occurrences:

(1) By sending Lovborg to a place where she knew he

... and it is not the only one which
... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ...

in the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

could get liquor freely.

(2) By burning the life's work of a man.

(3) By giving her gun to Lovborg, thus subtly insinuating that death might be easy for him.

If a woman could stoop to such crimes, or abet them, surely, she could surrender her body to a man, especially when she loathed her husband, always admitting she married him for maintenance.

But I think Ibsen killed her off because ~~he~~ was in the habit of ending his plays that way, and, also, that suicide might display a quixote idealism on her part. Hedda had always kept herself within the limits of Platonic vice; she had called this restraint "virtue;" maybe Ibsen had Hedda kill herself so that she could die in this supreme virtue! Quien sabe?

THE MASTER BUILDER

This drama, "The Master Builder" seems to mark a certain definite point in Ibsen's intellectual development, and the strangest part of the entire situation is that the poet realizes it does. So many people who have become famous simply can not bear to take defeat in the form of old age and incapability. It would appear Ibsen had thought out the whole thing in a logical fashion; he saw age creeping on him, and a new generation growing up about him. What to do? In the artist's mind there was only one thing to do---accept the facts and make the most of a sad truth.

"The Master Builder" is the real tragedy of a guilty conscience, for the protagonist, Solness, who is a self-made man, is a man of conscience and quite capable of sympathy. Solness seems to be Ibsen himself, and their relation becomes more and more apparent as the play progresses.

Solness, through hard work, has become the Master Builder; he is world-known for his creations, yet he sees that the young lad in his employment (Ragnar) is artistically gifted and that unless he discourages the boy's genius, soon Ragnar will take Solness' place as the Master Builder. The self-made man will not bear the thought, and in order that Ragnar's talent might lie undiscovered, Solness sets about to alienate the boy's

betrothed, Kaya Fosli. Kaya is captured by the older man's charm and falls a susceptible prey to his intrigue. Of course Solness uses her only as one more victim to his success, and when he is satisfied that Ragnar's genius is destroyed by a broken heart, Solness cruelly dismisses Kaya from his sight. To him it was only an eposide; the end justified the means.

But in this play "The Master Builder," Ibsen does make one perfect and evident development in the character of Hilda Wangel---the young girl of "The Lady from the Sea." Hilda has made Solness' acquaintance ten years ago, and at that time he promised to return for her after a lapse of years; as he broke this promise, Hilda holds no scruples about fulfilling it for him. She enters the Master Builder's life like some inhibited grissette, for though she admires Solness and loves him, yet---she witholds herself from him. Hilda makes one advance over Hedda because Hilda subjects herself to gossip and laughs at it.

It is no wonder that Solness becomes so absorbed in Hilda; she is young, vivid, and Ibsen still has her repeating her favorite childhood expression-"Oh, it was so thrilling, somehow." Her naive faith in Solness' power is admirable; she is the epitomy of true devotion to her ideal, and it is she who has the power to make Solness concede to youth, for,

at her request, he gives the young Ragnar a good recommendation. Thus, Solness has helped the new generation to rise; a generation which he knows well will overthrow him! But Hilda's influence is too powerful; he dares not fall below her expectations.

It is this craving to make himself heroic in her eyes that he promises to repeat his magnificent feat of years ago---that of climbing to the top of the tower over his home and place a wreath upon its pinnacle. Here Ibsen uses psychology; the old artist, Solness, knows he is incapable of performing the deed, but to gratify Hilda's desire and his own egotism, he makes the ascent that everyone has begged him to refrain from. The result is as expected; Solness manages to mount the tower and to place the garland thereon---but he does not get away! For one terrible moment he wavers and then takes that dreadful plunge earthward. Solness, the Master Builder, is no more, and he loses his life in the attempt to live up to Hilda's idea of him.¹

What Ibsen offers us in this play is the spectacular and effective; like Solness, he fears the rising generation, and knows he must be relegated to the rear-rank. But why not take your medicine like a man---meet the inevitable without flinching and keep a smiling countenance!

1. Commentary on Writings of Ibsen: H. H. Boyesen.

"The Master Builder" is Ibsen's last greatest play of his career, like Solness he has become world-famous, and now the time has come for him to slip back into nonentity, and let the younger artists usurp his place. Henrik Ibsen seems to have snapped off the light of own genius in this drama when he plunged the Master Builder to his death. His next and last three dramas exhibit a gradual loosening of the dramatist's hold upon vitally dramatic phases of human existence.¹ The magnificence of the poet is displayed more than ever when we realize his courage in writing "The Master Builder," for how few of us are ready to admit our tale is told and that the grave lies around the corner? Not so with Ibsen, he faced death as he faced life---truthfully acknowledging the facts. The saddest part of life is that none of us---great or small---can become philosophical about old age. If only we could abide by that quaint and invigorating idea of Rabbi Ben Ezra:--"Grow old along with me, the best is yet to be!"

1. European Dramatists: Archibald Henderson.

LITTLE EYOLF

This play might be a development from "Ghosts" in delivering the same message that children suffer through their parent's deeds. Allmers and Rita in this play take on the part of parents who, through carelessness and their own passion, are the cause of little Eyolf's (their only child) fall from a table---a fall that crippled him for life. It treats of rather a sordid theme; in this play, Ibsen certainly hits the vulgar! He does not make any subtle hints about sex, here, but rips away the veil and shows life and love with a vengeance.

The relation between Allmers and Rita, when we reach them in the first act is decidedly strained. Rita represents the woman who craves affection and love from her husband, while Allmers is the cold, calculating type who is repulsed by passion. Once he was responsive to Rita's desires, but now he is determined to give all his attention to his cripple-son, Eyolf. The very thought of his alienated affections tears Rita to pieces, and in a mad moment she wished Eyolf dead. This wish is fulfilled at the end of the first act, for Eyolf falls off the edge of the wharf into the ford.

From this point on, Ibsen moves his drama with an intense rapidity that is almost horrifying. Rita and Allmers go

THE FIRST

This story is a sequel to the first.

In the first story the hero was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

The hero of the first story was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

The hero of the first story was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

The hero of the first story was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

THE FIRST

The hero of the first story was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

The hero of the first story was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

The hero of the first story was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

The hero of the first story was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

The hero of the first story was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

The hero of the first story was a young man who had just

left his home and was on his way to the city.

through that dreadful state of a guilty conscience which results only in misery for both of them. There is one tragic scene when Allmers casts all the blame upon his wife's shoulders and she, in turn, shields herself by making bitter invectives against him. The whole situation is grotesquely real; one feels the futility of their quarrels, yet one realizes that each has an ideal to uphold and in doing so, swords must clash and blood must be shed. I think that this is the only play of Ibsen which reveals human nature in the flesh, so to speak. All his other plays moistened our eyes and awakened our hearts; but it is "Little Eyolf" with its pathos, its tragedy, its overwhelming gravity, that startles us from our seats and makes us drink in the air, sharply, as if we were trying to purge our soul from the dreadful taint it has received by being connected with so indelicate a theme.

The character of Eyolf links up with Hedvig; she was so sweet, so admirable, and so undaunted in her suffering just as Eyolf was---poor, little Eyolf who wanted to be a soldier---a soldier, with his tragic, maimed body good only for an invalid's chair. There is something uncanny in Ibsen's treatment of children; he seems to take their little, sad lives and turn them into big, happy children through the power of death. Hedvig became magnificent in death; we forgot her weak eyes in remembering her great heart. Little

Eyolf, the pitiful cripple, became glorified in death. A little hero who is sacrificed upon the altar of the Gods.

The character of the Rat-Wife in this play seems to be the use of the symbolic which Ibsen had been developing ever since "The Wild Duck." The Rat-Wife symbolized Death; she fascinated one by her "still, soft darkness," that is associated with shadows and grave-yards. She is a purely fantastic creature and serves Ibsen's purpose completely---that of luring the impressionable Eyolf to follow her, just as the rats do, down into the depths of the sea.

This play, "Little Eyolf," is full of quality; it is both a charming and repellent, and above all, a beautiful piece of art. The terribleness of the drama fascinated me beyond words. I studied this work again and again and while I admit the play does not follow Ibsen's general trend of development, and is a letting-up of his intellectual evolution, yet I must admit it holds a unique place in his works.

Even if one did not know the date of "Little Eyolf," one could confidently assign it to the latest period of Ibsen's career, on noting a certain difference of scale between its foundations and its superstructure.¹ All Ibsen's later plays show a decided turn of technique---that of passing, as soon as his drama opens, from inventive genius

to a genius more interested in analysis. Ibsen becomes absorbed in the souls of his actors---an interest which he always displayed, yet it took three periods of writing before it was perfectly developed. His last two plays show more and more evidence of this penchant, and the Norwegian Seer ends his play-writing career by casually shifting the slant of his keen eyes from the character itself to the soul of the character.

JOHN GABRIEL BORKMAN

The central figure of this drama, "John Gabriel Borkman," is an unscrupulous financier who married for a career, and who is so full of self-complaisance that when defeat comes and overthrows him mercilessly, he still persists in his belief that the world has wronged him. Borkman was a fool; he was a man who strutted, and his struttings resembled those of a peacock that has lost its feathers. The close kinship of Borkman to Bernick in "The Pillars of Society" is amazing, for both men are guilty of similar crimes; both had given up their true loves for the sake of their own business interests, and both men were placed between two sisters.

These two sisters, Gunhild and Ella Rentheim, remind us greatly of Lona Hessel and Mrs. Bernick of "Pillars of Society." Ella is a continuation of Lona---the rejected woman who is all tender devotion to the man who so cruelly jilted her to marry "money," while Gunhild Borkman represents Mrs. Bernick, the woman who won the man, but whose victory contained certain heartbreaking drawbacks. This drama, "John Gabriel Borkman," displays a marvelous indication of Ibsen's development, for we can trace back the Ella and Gunhild types to "The Feast at Solhaug." Remember the character of the mad Alfild who revenges herself on Olaf after his desertion! Remember the

furious Hjordis in "The Vikings of Helgeland" as opposed to the sweet, amiable Dagny! Remember the wild and savage reckless gypsy girl, Gerd in "Brand," and then recall the beautiful devotion of the altruistic Agnes!

In the character of Toldal, Ibsen seems to have been inspired by Lyngstrand of "The Lady from the Sea"---that poor failure who thought he was fated to be a great sculptor. Toldal lived on the thought that the tragedy which he had written in his youth would someday be recognized and he would be famous. Ibsen seems to have some sympathy for failures in this drama; for instance, he did not paint old Toldal with too dashing a brush, but left him more in the kindliness of thickening shadows. Sometimes I thought I heard the old poet's outcry in this play as he, too, felt the hand of ice near his heart, and in place of his usual stern countenance and unyielding personality, he seems to repeat to the world the words of Ella Rentheim to her sister:

"Yes, the coldness of heart is gone. And now I think we two may hold out our hands to each other."¹

The remarkable feature of this late drama is Ibsen's feat of carrying through the entire action of a four-act play without so much as a single break; but this close observance to the unity of time is more curious than important. While we must

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume XI
Page 323.

admit "John Gabriel Borkman" displays great technical skill, yet we can not help realizing that Ibsen's sticking-force is losing its hold; Ibsen seems to become weary; he starts with a flourish which is entirely lacking before the end of the second act and the final scenes of his later plays compare unfavorably to those of earlier days. It is not that the Norwegian Seer can not hold the tension up to the very last; it is simply that his creative energy has been used beyond endurance in such dramas as "Hedda Gabler," "Ghosts," or "The Wild Duck" and the time has come for relaxation.

From "The Wild Duck" to "John Gabriel Borkman" Ibsen has travelled a long distance.¹ "The Wild Duck" is the work of an exuberant artist while "John Gabriel Borkman" is the work of an old man. Ibsen sees the power of love, and realizes what a life-force it is; he brings out this idea strongly in Ella's remark to Borkman:²

"You have killed the love-life in me. The Bible speaks of a mysterious sin for which there is no forgiveness.....now I understand.....that great, unpardonable sin is to murder the love life in a human soul."

1. The New Ibsen: Otto Weigand.

2. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume XI
Page 246.

Thus, Ibsen shows the havoc that denial of affection may cause in the lives of those who crave love. His lesson is this: pick up the threads of a broken kinship before a careless wind scatters them beyond collection---to live with a hating heart is to live with no heart at all. This is the lesson that the aged poet tries to teach, and we may all agree that the very fact of his teaching such a lesson admits the reluctant truth. Ibsen---the upstart, unconventional dramatist becomes Ibsen---the quiet, almost God-fearing Christian.

WHEN WE DEAD AWAKEN

This last drama of Ibsen's is the last of a series of dramas in which personal confession had more and more become the dominant chord.¹ Professor Rubek is like Ibsen, himself, for he, too, has made a world-renowned reputation, and like Rubek, feels the futility of his success. There is something in this play that is akin to Ibsen's calvary and resurrection; one feels he has suffered the tortures of the damned and has finally risen from his bed of pain, a new man.

The drama itself is quite short; the characters number seven, and of these seven only three have leading parts. In this play, as in his others, Ibsen uses the fifth-act method and the drama starts where the action is over---Professor Rubek was the young sculptor who had fought his way to fame through the help of Irene, a woman who loved the man in him, but loathed the artist; she was a true Ibsen-woman. She sacrifices her own life for his success, and manages to inspire him to create a statue, called "The Resurrection Day"---a statue of a woman in the nude who is "filled with a sacred joy at finding herself unchanged in the higher, freer, happier region after the long dreamless sleep of death." It was Irene's utter co-operation in Rubek's work that lead to the statues final magnificence; "The Resurrection Day" was a chef d'oeuvre.

1. The New Ibsen: Otto Weigand.

and its reputation brought for Rubek what he thought he most desired---Fame. But the artist had not considered the "woman" in his model; he was so engaged in eating up the sweet morsels of victory that dropped by his side that he, thoughtlessly enough, rewarded Irene's loyalty by an icy "Thank you for a priceless episode." The word "episode" rankled in her heart, but she took the hint and quietly dropped out of his life.

Now, we find Rubek and his wife, Maia, striving to outlive the ennui that their marriage has brought. Rubek hates Maia; Maia hates Rubek; both are ready to go off the deep end, but one needs a partner to do the jumping with, and naturally the necessary partners appear. Irene returns with a host of dead husbands as trophies, and she pounces upon Rubek as another prey; the word "episode" still rankles in her heart. Maia's partner is Wefheim, a crude bear-hunter, but he serves the purpose, and she is only too glad to have found him. Thus, Rubek has found his model---Irene, and he admits to her that, though success came, life has been a failure. Here, Ibsen again has the opportunity of repeating a Lona-Bernick scene, an Asta-Allmers scene, or an Ella-Borkman scene: the scene of "what-might-have-been-had-you-not-left-me" which is Ibsen's specialty; Irene berates Rubek's heartlessness; she was destined for love, caresses, sacred moments, and motherhood, all these Rubek could have given,

yet he repulsed her, sent her away. Oh, the poignancy of dreams-shattered now renewed! It is as if Ibsen coils his very heart-fibres about the sorrows of misdirected amours and cries out: "Oh, God, isn't there some way we can start anew? Some way in which we can undo the past, and live in freedom and in peace?" For a moment, the Norwegian Seer forgets the wisdom of the old Greek's proverb that even God is deprived of one power: that of making what has been as never having been.

Irene and Rubek see the falsity of their lives, and Rubek begs her to come to some decision that will alleviate his sufferings; she forgets the word "episode;" she becomes all woman, and her heart becomes a silk doormat upon which the broken sculptor may wipe his tired feet after their long travel, searching for happiness that will lead him into the promised land.

Rubek: "And will you come with me, Irene?"

Irene: "Yes, surely I will come. Wait for me."

Rubek: "Summer night! With you. With you. Oh, Irene, that might have been our life-and that we have forfeited-we two."

Irene: "We see only the irretrievable when---"

Rubek: "When-----?"

Irene: "When we dead awaken."¹

The dead may awaken if only they can find an honest and natural relation in which they shall no longer sacrifice and slay one another.² Ibsen gives out a last cry; in this last play one can detect no falling-off of the artist. His play is less extravagant, less magnificent, if you will, but certainly not less inferior. The play carries all the poignant charm of the artist; and he has sacrificed his genius in writing this play---even his very life. But was it not worth it? The master-hand had travelled over many pages; it had written many plays, and surely was it not right that such a hand should give a last final click to the door of its ideals before it settled down into the quiet, restful security of a well-earned vacation. "When We Dead Awaken" is a good ending to a good set of plays; it is a gentle premonition of the artist's coming end, and it is like a benediction that seems to infuse the very atmosphere with incense and the odor of burning candles. The Sister of Mercy who stands alone at the very end of the last act is the epitome of sacred moments and holy thoughts---her voice and its cry ring forever in the ears of those who have studied and learned to love Ibsen---the man, and the

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume XI
Page 131.

2. Quintessence of Ibsenism: George Bernard Shaw.

There is a great deal of...

The first and most important thing is to have a good understanding of the situation. It is only when we have a clear picture of the facts that we can make a proper judgment. This is especially true in the case of a business, where the stakes are high and the consequences of a wrong decision can be disastrous. Therefore, it is essential to take the time to gather all the relevant information and to analyze it carefully. Only then can we make a sound decision that will lead to the best possible outcome. In the case of a business, this means looking at the market, the competition, and the financial situation. It also means understanding the needs and desires of the customers. Only by having a complete picture of the situation can we make a decision that will be in the best interests of the business.

1. Collection of data; 2. Analysis of data; 3. Synthesis of data; 4. Decision making.

Page 124.

1. Importance of the situation; 2. Importance of the facts; 3. Importance of the decision.

artist---and these same people repeat in unison after her,
 sending out her message to that great man whose body lies
 in the deep solitude of his grave:

"Pax Vobiscum."¹

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume XI
 Page 456.

at least--and these are really cases of human effort
 setting out for man's benefit, and not just for the sake
 of the thing itself, as in the case of the
 "artificial" cases.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

CRITICAL EVALUATION OF HIS THIRD
AND LAST PERIOD

"Rosmersholm," Ibsen's play that begins his Third and Last Period seems to me to be the reply to all the daring interrogatories of Mrs. Alving. Ibsen has taken Helen Alving and changed her into a Rebecca West. This Rebecca has all Mrs. Alving's staunchness of character, but surpasses her in that she possesses a fascination almost uncanny in its power.

Rebecca is the personification of the Norseland--the land from whence she came, the land of extreme transitions, of unbroken darkness, and the land of violent, uncontrolled temperaments.

The intrigue of the play seems to be better adapted for a novel than for the stage. Ibsen relates the chief events of the leading lady, Rebecca, but these events are unable to be presented.

Rosmer's attitude toward Rebecca is ethereal; to him she is the incarnation of moral purity, and he resents any accusation against this purity. Ibsen must have spent a great deal of time on Rosmer, for Rosmer is the embodiment of spiritual and earthly elements. I could hardly realize that such a man existed,--let alone the poet, Ibsen, admitting his existence.

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

"Henceforth," I have said, that I have

been very much interested in the

all the other interesting things of the world.

and I have been very much interested in the

the history of the world, and I have been

very much interested in the history of the

the history of the world.

I have been very much interested in the

the history of the world, and I have been

very much interested in the history of the

the history of the world.

The history of the world is a very

very much interested in the history of the

the history of the world, and I have been

the history of the world.

the history of the world, and I have been

very much interested in the history of the

the history of the world, and I have been

very much interested in the history of the

the history of the world, and I have been

very much interested in the history of the

the history of the world.

"Rosmersholm" is beautifully tragic; I could not help pitying the dead wife who sacrificed so much for her husband's future, and equally I sympathized with the passionate nature of Rebecca that finally submitted to sacrifice in order to prove its worth.

The last scene of this play reaches a high pitch of emotional intensity. We have the deceived Rosmer, the tragic-figure of Rebecca, and the dead wife ever haunting her old home. I wondered if Rebecca would be brave enough to cast herself into the cataract, or whether she were only teasing Rosmer to obtain, through his fear, forgiveness. But Rebecca has realized her sin, and realized how much Rosmer must have suffered and she willingly submits to be sacrificed.

The glorious part of this play was Rosmer's willingness to follow her to death; his affection for her was so deeply rooted that he, being convinced of her true contrition, resolves that, although she must give up her life, he will also die with her. Ibsen has painted these two creatures with a magnificent color; he has allowed this ripe color to deepen with the aging of the characters until finally they both merge their colors into one radiant hue when they embrace before leaping into the cataract.

As I finished reading this play I thought how pertinent a lesson Ibsen had taught: the hands of the dead are ever upon the lives of the living, and whether a man will or not--- he must needs yield his daily tribute of sacrifice.

"Gentlemanly" is essentially a quality; I shall not say

that the quality is not a quality, but that the quality is

not a quality, but that the quality is not a quality.

of the quality is not a quality, but that the quality is

not a quality.

The last sentence of this letter is a little more of

an official statement. It says that the quality is not a

quality of the quality, but that the quality is not a

quality. I wonder if the quality is not a quality.

perhaps that the quality is not a quality, but that the

quality is not a quality, but that the quality is not a

quality. I wonder if the quality is not a quality.

perhaps that the quality is not a quality, but that the

quality is not a quality, but that the quality is not a

quality. I wonder if the quality is not a quality.

perhaps that the quality is not a quality, but that the

quality is not a quality, but that the quality is not a

quality. I wonder if the quality is not a quality.

perhaps that the quality is not a quality, but that the

quality is not a quality, but that the quality is not a

quality. I wonder if the quality is not a quality.

perhaps that the quality is not a quality, but that the

quality is not a quality, but that the quality is not a

quality. I wonder if the quality is not a quality.

perhaps that the quality is not a quality, but that the

quality is not a quality, but that the quality is not a

"The Lady from the Sea" is a fantastical bit of work; Ibsen uses the mysterious woodland to bring out the character of Rebecca in "Rosmersholm."

Ellida's whole life, until her marriage to Dr. Wangle, was spent on the ocean. She was the daughter of a lighthouse-keeper, and Ibsen brings home to us the fact that one who has lived near the ocean can never be acclimated to the shut-in life of a mountaineer.

The Stranger in this play produces a very grotesque effect; I fancy that Ibsen did not care much whether the audience believed the stranger to be real or simply a ghost of Ellida's past. I prefer to think of the Stranger as a haunting ghost who---instead of hurting Ellida---shows her her true happiness. Women are ever dissatisfied; give them a crown and they will cast it aside, but try to take away that crown and they will throw a fit of hysterics. So it was with Ellida; she had Dr. Wangle and she did not want him. She preferred, instead, to return to her native abode---the ocean.

Ibsen must have had a quiet laugh over Ellida, for she is, without doubt, the most comic of his female characters. The scene where the Stranger, Ellida, and the Doctor meet borders on comedy. I can hear the Stranger imploring Ellida to leave her husband and go with him; I can hear the doctor's wild, passionate cries for her to stay with him---and over all

"The last time we saw him," he said, "was in 1910."

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

seen him in 1910, and that he had seen him in 1910.

He then told me that he had seen him in 1910, and that he had

I hear the emotional outburst of the wavering Ellida:

"Oh! What is it that tempts, and allures, and entices---towards the unknown! The whole might of the sea centered upon me!"¹

Then let us see the quick transition of Ellida as her husband renounces all claim upon her, and gives her full permission to depart in peace with the Stranger.

"In freedom---and on my own responsibility? Responsibility, too?-that transforms everything."²

After this speech she mentally settles herself in her husband's arms. Ibsen has no more to say. He has rung the curtain down saying to himself---"try to keep a woman from going to hell and she will kill people to get there--but tell her to go there and she will never go." Why? Simply the perverseness of female reasoning.

"Hedda Gabler" is what I term---in Ibsen's development---a mental caprice. He indulges in a play that has no didactic impulse, and he furnishes the audience with a character so glossed over with the veneer of aristocracy that her rotten nature is imperceptible.

Hedda is a despicable character. She is cowardly, conventional, commonplace, spiteful, and decadent. She has

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume IX Page 421.

2. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume IX Page 431.

I have the pleasure to inform you that the
order for the purchase of the above mentioned
quantity of goods has been placed with the
proper authorities and will be forwarded to you
as soon as the same are received.

Very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
J. H. [Name]

The enclosed bill of exchange is for the
amount of the sum of [Amount] and is payable
to the order of [Name] and will be cashed
by the bank on the day of its maturity.
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt
of your letter of the [Date] and in reply
to inform you that the same has been
forwarded to the proper authorities for
their consideration.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
J. H. [Name]

I have the pleasure to inform you that the
order for the purchase of the above mentioned
quantity of goods has been placed with the
proper authorities and will be forwarded to you
as soon as the same are received.

an insatiable vanity, and her life is one grand race for sensations. A woman in form, but a devil in spirit might easily describe her. She has taken a makeshift husband, Tesman, and forbidden him conjugal rights. She has cast aside a lover when he was poor; but is perfectly willing to destroy him now that he is a rich and famous man.

I can trace this play from its predecessors, notably "Ghosts" and "Rosmersholm". Mrs. Alving aired her opinions; but convention stopped her from acting. Rebecca was the influence in Rosmer's life; but in the end she preferred death rather than cause his complete ruin. Hedda did not think; she acted. She was a vain peacock who forgot that without her feathers she would be like all other birds. Her so-called good-breeding is nothing but a hiding-post for her bad manners; for in the name of culture she inflicts pain on all who prick her sensitive vanity.

Lovborg is her lover in imagination, for the vile mind of Hedda revels in degeneracy. She loves "closet-talk," and scandal is the bread which maintains her sensuous body.

I quickly compare Hedda with Hjordis, for has not Ibsen given us here the old, romantic Hjordis of "The Vikings" in a modern riding habit? Her husband, Tesman, is a Gunnar in the guise of a scientific lecturer. Tesman is a fool; he is

in direct contrast to the genius, Lovborg. One can hardly blame Hedda for hating her husband who turns out to be only the pedantic collector of musty folios; but we can blame her for her dastardly conduct to Lovborg. Merely to destroy a man's life just for the sake of showing that she can control a human being is the lowest form of vanity. Hedda has no real ability; she plays with fire, but cries with anguish if she is the least bit burnt. Hedda goes to the precipice, but she refuses to cast herself down. She reminds me of that precious male, Helmer (Doll's House) who was so submerged in his own conventional snobbishness that he resembled a grotesque mummy.

In this play as all others, Ibsen displays a marvelous knowledge of human nature, and he has no false modesty when it comes to portraying that mad sex---females.

"The Master Builder" is one of Ibsen's greatest contributions to drama. Its very aliveness frightens us; but we realize how true are Ibsen's sentiments. The old Darwinian theory of survival of the fittest strikes at every scene in this play. Solness has rooted out others to gain his strength as an architect, and in turn others are fighting to usurp his place; but Solness is made of that firm marble which will chip off bit by bit, but will never be completely demolished. It seems to me that Solness' only fault is his brutality in crushing out the genius of younger men, especially Ragnar. It is hard to imagine a man so devoid of propriety as to form connections

with a young girl for simply mercenary means. Solness' attitude toward Kaja Fosli is utterly sinful; he cares nothing for her and only desires her to serve him for a space of time. And how easily he dismisses her when the allotted time has passed! Without any scruples he lets her go from him---or rather makes her go from him.

The coming of Hilda Wangle into Solness' life tears away his every habit. He hates to show himself less of a man than Hilda has painted him for ten long years, and we see Hilda force Solness out of his ignoble sphere of superman and force him to the physical feat of standing on a pinnacle, alone and free.

This feat which Hilda demands Solness to do seems to me to be a picture of Ibsen's mind. He, too, is creeping into old age; youth is heading him off; age is enfeebling his mental gymnastics---he asks himself the question---can I climb to the peak and stay? The answer is in Solness' tumble headlong to the earth, for this fall symbolizes the great tragedy of life; that youth will always conquer old age which in its struggle for survival will always grow dizzy, lose its grip, and finally crash to the earth.

I fancy that "The Master Builder" marks a culminating point in Ibsen's literary career. He looks back and glows with pride at his development; he looks forward and sees---only disaster. The man has touched the pinnacle; he has

climbed high and he stands alone the world---but for only a moment---a vertigo overtakes him in his splendor and he falls to earth---quietly and swiftly.

"Little Eyolf" is Ibsen at his saddest. It would seem that he had entered the kingdom of God and came back to earth suffering with disillusion and pain to think that God allowed this foul globe to exist.

"Little Eyolf" treats of the relation of parents to a child. In this play Ibsen revealed his view of human nature when his characters, Rita and Allmers says:¹

Rita: "We are creatures of earth after all."

Allmers: "But something akin to the sea and the heavens, too, Rita."

Ibsen discusses the theory of "law of change" in this play, and he admits that all human conditions are subject to this law. "Little Eyolf" is Ibsen's poem on "Metamorphosis," because it deals with the transmutations of which classic mythology speaks so often. In this drama we see the "law of change" displayed in the formation and transformation of human farlings, in human feelings dying out and coming to life again, in the progress and decline of the play itself.²

Eyolf's death is an epoch-making calamity in this play, and Allmers and Rita are always discussing the cause,

1. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: William Archer. Volume XI
Page 98.

2. Henrik Ibsen: Critical Studies: George Brandes.

...and ...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

...
...
...

fault and responsibility of Eyolf's fall which crippled him for life, and after his death they only harden and embitter each other by their accusations and reproaches.

For a while I wondered just what was Ibsen's purpose in this play, but it came to me with surprising rapidity at the end of the play by means of Rita's resolution. Ibsen then proceeds to show that all incidents have an interpretation. Little Eyolf did not live and die in vain, for his very memory has changed Allmers and Rita into human-beings who set about doing the great philanthropic work of caring for other people's children.

"John Gabriel Borkman" is the first play which openly reveals the fact that the writer is no longer a young man. It contains a great forbearance toward human failings.

Borkman is a Solness whom fortune has deserted; but who still retains his egotism. He is a Bernick in that he sacrifices the happiness of one sister and marries the other from a purely mercenary point.

Was Borkman ever great? I can hardly believe that Ibsen's intention was to represent him as a man of extraordinary powers. I fancy that the poet was scoffing at geniuses---he allowed Borkman the privilege of labelling himself "genius,"---but at the same time he let his audience see the foolishness of a man who "if'd" through life!

Borkman's "if-language" is the talk of fools; a truly great man never says "if", and he never admits obstacles. Borkman spends all his time in lamentations, and I have read and reread the play---yet I can not comprehend that Ibsen---the great dramatist---intended us to regard John Gabriel as a true genius.

The three principal scenes in this play are

- (1) The meeting of Ella and Gunhild, the two sisters;
- (2) The meeting between Ella and Borkman;
- (3) The first conversation between Borkman and his wife---and these scenes are all executed with consummate skill.

The construction of this drama is praiseworthy, and it rises to its height of four stories as if built of iron set upon a granite foundation. From start to finish it is intense in its feelings, and the action advances as swiftly as a meteor through the air. "John Gabriel Borkman" is a play that a student of Ibsen will always do well to spend much time on---for in this play lies many an Ibsen secret, and it leaves you wondering whether the poet was really in sympathy with this ruined Napoleon, or whether he was laughing at him and his pitiable illusions.

The last work of Ibsen's "When We Dead Awaken" is a fitting name to a piece written by a man who is about to die.

However, one can not help noticing that the poet's instinct for dialogue in this final drama is just as concise as in "The Master Builder," "Hedda Gabler," or other earlier pieces.

"When We Dead Awaken" is somewhat of a romantic-dream; Ibsen tries to make his protagonist a man who has won the race, but to whom the glory has no appeal. As usual, the Norwegian Seer is trying to teach his audience a lesson---the lesson that coldness of heart is a most dissatisfying disease. In youth Rubek had desired fame, wealth, world-renown, and nothing was to be allowed to stand in his way. By Rubek's complete indifference to the world and its wayfarers, he had won this success. But what price glory? Only the awful fact that he was a man-alone, unloving and unloved. It was as though his living body were ashes already set in an urn upon the parlor mantle-piece! His wife, Maia, became as wives generally become---a sort of necessary nuisance. Ibsen, the artist, seemed to voice the question of Rubek, the sculptor; is it worth while to sacrifice one's life in order to create life? The answer is not found in the play, for Ibsen has still clung persistently to the unsatisfactory endings which take us back to "A Doll's House" and "Ghosts."

The play reeks of pessimism; Ibsen portrays Rubek as a man who chased shadows instead of chasing rainbows. Rubek is hungry for affection, and his hunger is all the more intensified by his realization that he has sacrificed all in return for.....nothing. Like Rubek, Ibsen did not want the plaudits of the people; he felt cold, and this coldness wrapped his body in an inviolable iceberg.

In the final scene of this play, one can easily recognize the connection between Brand's upward climb ("Brand") and Rubek's upward climb---the difference being that Brand climbs up with an Ideal, while Rubek has for his partner, Irene. Also, in this play, we hear much about the "joy of life," a phrase with which we became familiar in "Ghosts." Both Maia and Oswald feel that everything in the world is subordinate to this "joy of life." This idea of the "joy of life" which is so strongly emphasized by Ibsen is heart-rending to those who have studied all his works, for it is as though Ibsen has turned upon himself and his creations, and with hatred in his eyes, heaped curses upon both; it is as if the artist had sat up in his coffin and proceeded to laugh at the flowers, the lighted candles, and the weeping friends that surrounded him.

"When We Dead Awaken" is Ibsen's art tribute on the altar of love; upon its surface, he has sketched faint

tracings from "Brand," from "Hedda Gabler," from "The Master Builder," and from "John Gabriel Borkman." At the final scene we hear again the same chant that rose above the crashing avalanche beneath which Brand was buried.¹

1. Henrik Ibsen. The Man and His Plays: Montrose J. Moses.

SUMMARY

My purpose in writing this thesis, "The Intellectual Evolution of Henrik Ibsen as a Dramatist," was to show, in the clearest possible manner, Ibsen's dramatic development, a development which grew from the poorest kind of melodrama to the most splendid portrayal of modern life and times. I have endeavored, by a thorough study of Ibsen's life and his works, to gather material relative to my subject; material which would prove beyond the shadow of a doubt the Poet's general intellectual ascent from his early years until the very beginning of the twentieth century when he reached the climax of his career. It was not an easy task; I realize many times my thoughts slip from their course and linger too long upon some other detail, completely irrelevant to the major subject, -yet it may be that, at times, it was necessary to deviate from the beaten track in order to bring to light some otherwise hidden idea which might bear upon the discussion in question in no small way.

There is no doubt of Ibsen's development; we can be sure of that. My business is to find evidences of this development; and I think the foregoing pages contain this

"evidence." Starting back with "Lady Inger of Ostrat" and working through Ibsen's three periods of development until we reach "When We Dead Awaken" certainly gave us a long road to travel. At times it was almost impossible to check up on his mental progressions, then again it would be a simple matter, the connections being extremely obvious.

To prove Ibsen's development we need only to regard his first play: (omitting "Cataline" in respect to Ibsen's desire that it be discounted) "Lady Inger of Ostrat." Here, in this very play, you get that blood and thunder ending where Lady Inger has her own son murdered (by mistake) and upon realizing her error sinks down unconscious on his coffin, and Lady Inger's daughter, Eline, has been betrayed by a foul man, Nils Lykke. The final scene reeks of tragedy and madness; this same scene is carried on through Ibsen's "melodramatic period," and is later modified or enlarged in his next "Realistic Period." Ibsen clings tenaciously to the horrible ending; it seems to be a part of his self-made creed (for Ibsen followed no dramatic rules or studied any text-books) to hurl bombastic endings at his audience---to chill their blood with a murder-scene such as Lady Inger killing her own son or to disturb the mental tranquillity of the average person by such a scene as Nora banging the front-door after her!

Ibsen, in every play, seemed to develop a greater penchant for catastrophe. At first his melodramatic tendencies superseded his technique; but later he dives nobly into the waves of realism and gives us such weirdly intense scenes as Oswald's imbecillic cry for the sun--- Hedda's and Hedvig's gun report---the drastic crash of Solness. The audience can only gasp at such slaughters, and marvel at Ibsen's ability to strew the stage with blood and tears in his final scenes. But Ibsen's dead was not the dead of Shakespeare; Ibsen's dead bodies are those of the exhausted or destroyed; he does not take a young life, full of joie de vivre and say "Die for love," but rather he takes the body of some poor idealist who sees his ideal rotting in the stagnant waters of its own depravity and remarks: "It's time for me to die."¹

Another remarkable Ibsen-trait which he perfected was the "two-type women" idea. Going back to "The Warriors at Helgeland" we find the mad, revengeful Hjordis in contrast to the gentle, devoted Dagny. Jumping a score of years, we see these two characters again under the names of Rebecca West and Beata; Rebecca is the artful woman who is the cause of the good wife, Beata, killing herself. Going on another few years, we find such a girl as Hedda; she is a nineteenth century Hjordis or Rebecca; she is domineering, impulsive, and

1. Ibsen's Women; Mary S. Gilliland.

utterly selfish. The sweet-Agnes-type of "Brand" has her development, too. Ibsen paints again and again this sweet, devotional type of female whose only desire in life is to please her beloved. Let us recall Lona Hessel, (Pillars of Society) Martha, (Pillars of Society) and that kind soul---the epitomy of self-sacrifice---Gina. (The Wild Duck). Each of these women is easily imposed upon by the other sex, and she adapts her easy disposition to any impositions. The power of knowing women and their reactions is a part of Ibsen's genius; he seems to be endowed with a feminine feeling---with a keen intuition for what a woman will or will not do.

Episodes in the dramas of Ibsen are not digressions. There is no superfluous verbage; all incidents lead up to the one consummation and every part bears a just relation to the symmetrical whole. Amid all the complications of plot, Ibsen never loses the grasp of the one-root idea; he has pet expressions that manifest his intellectual trend:-

"The Pretenders": much talk about "kingly-thought."

"Peer Gynt": the command is evident, "be true to thyself."

"Brand": the phrase of "all or nothing." "Emperor and Galilean": Talk of the "Third Empire." "Doll's House": much chatter about "miracles." "Ghosts": The recurring phrase about "joy of living." "The League of Youth": we hear all about the "local situation." "An Enemy of the

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

People": the ruling thought is the "compact majority." "The Wild Duck" we have the "Ideal demand." "The Lady from the Sea": the maxim expounded is "freedom of will." "Little Eyolf": the words used as a guide through the thought of the action are, "the law of change." "The Master Builder": "home that bears a steeple." "Hedda Gabler": the cue words are "dying in beauty." "John Gabriel Borkman": the phrase runs, "great mortal sin." These phrases compromise the gist of Ibsen's personal philosophies, and show how closely he adhered to the "main-theme" idea in dramatic representations.

Let us note Ibsen's adherence to the "Unities;" he did adhere to them, but only because they suited his artistic intention. It is the nature of his plots that their actions proceed with great gusto. "The Doll's House" was played in two and one-half days; "Rosmersholm" in fifty-two hours. "The Wild Duck," in forty hours. "Little Eyolf," in thirty-six hours. "Ghosts," in sixteen hours. "Lady Inger of Ostrat," (His first play) in five hours. The situation of his plays was very simple. "Ghosts" had only one setting: the living-room in Mrs. Alving's house. "Hedda Gabler" was staged in a room at Tesman's house.

Ibsen was the instinctive dramatist. His plays became a part of himself; the characters seemed to grow up in his mind, and they were nourished by his imagination. The artist's characters, from earliest plays onward, are a true

the first of these is the "Theater of the World," which is a

very large and very beautiful building, and is the largest

theater in the world, and is the largest theater in the world.

The second of these is the "Theater of the World," which is a

very large and very beautiful building, and is the largest

theater in the world, and is the largest theater in the world.

The third of these is the "Theater of the World," which is a

very large and very beautiful building, and is the largest

theater in the world, and is the largest theater in the world.

The fourth of these is the "Theater of the World," which is a

very large and very beautiful building, and is the largest

theater in the world, and is the largest theater in the world.

The fifth of these is the "Theater of the World," which is a

very large and very beautiful building, and is the largest

theater in the world, and is the largest theater in the world.

The sixth of these is the "Theater of the World," which is a

very large and very beautiful building, and is the largest

theater in the world, and is the largest theater in the world.

The seventh of these is the "Theater of the World," which is a

very large and very beautiful building, and is the largest

theater in the world, and is the largest theater in the world.

The eighth of these is the "Theater of the World," which is a

very large and very beautiful building, and is the largest

theater in the world, and is the largest theater in the world.

house of representatives, coming from all sections of the community. He gives us the wily politician, the adoring child, the heart-broken beloved, the mercenary blackguard, the bewitching Delilah, and the admirable wife or mother. Ibsen's characters are like the temple of the Holy Ghost---they move you, at moments, by a vague sense of mystery and awe.¹

It is rather fatal to one's illusions to read Ibsen ensemble, so to speak. His works, coming one after the other, are like a barrage of shells, each one seeming to be more violent than its predecessor. His dramas have a startling effect on our amour-propre; we feel a bit antagonistic toward the man who rips away our cloak of self-splendor and leaves us standing naked, a piece of flesh at which the world might jeer! At times his plays seemed like some Chamber of Horrors that piece by piece extended to the darkest section of Hades; at first I was led on by "novelty," "surprise," "audacity" and "plain talk," and it was only when I came upon some hideous truth that I realized to follow-on I should have to relinquish my easy mind and my smug existence. Ibsen demands much of his readers; his works are not diverting tales with which we may pass a dull evening. They are debates, polemics, and controversial; they smack of quick wit and keen satire; they sharpen the tired brain with their biting invectives. Ibsen's

1. Ibsen's Women: Mary S. Gilliland.

...of management, ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...
...the ...

plays remind me of those "mirrors" found in the amusement parks, for they, too, picture you first as a tall, gaping yokel, then as some short, fat nit-wit, and lastly as some thin, scrawny anemic until you feel yourself a mass of disproportion and ugliness. Yet, withal, his plays fascinate us; they may repel, at times, but for the most part they interest us, completely. Henderson¹ says that Ibsen's pathological pre-occupations should not lessen the importance of his works---his dalliances with sick consciences, obsessed personalities, wounded souls and disillusioned fatalists should not be criticised as "obscene" or "vulgar." Ibsen wrote from the heart; he had faith in the people's intelligence, and the very spirit of our times, the pressure of the age, and the most fruitful germs of modern culture are embodied in Ibsen's plays.

Before I close, it seems only fitting to speak of the great man's last days. He had spent a mentally-active life. We recall his three periods of development; and I might add here that Ibsen spent a great deal of his time reading the two German poets: Otto Ludwig (1813-1865) and Freidrich Hebbel (1813-1863). These two poets passed from Romanticism to Realism and so on to Mysticism in a manner like Ibsen, whom it is possible that they influenced.

1. European Dramatists: Archibald Henderson. Page 116.

It was not an easy task to evolve from melodrama to symbolism, and the mental strain was too great. His last play, "When We Dead Awaken" is not exactly a continuance of the crescendo scale; it does contain sparks of his former genius, but it mostly represents the quiet decay of an overstrained mentality. It is as though the whole phantasmagoria of Ibsen's life had filtered through his weakening brain, and he had caught fitful gleams of past glories.¹

Like Solness he was stricken down in his glory, for in 1902 an apoplectic stroke seized him from which he never quite recovered. The mind of the Norwegian Seer became a blank; his actions became childish and his eyes took on a vacant glassiness which bespeaks the muddled brain.

Henrik Ibsen lived for seven years in this awful state, only showing signs of life when his wife or his three grandchildren, Tankred, Irene, and Eleanora, came into his room. Ibsen never lost his deep affection for his wife, and to the last retained his quaint habit of calling her by the most extraordinary pet name: "My Cat."

He died at his home in Drammensvej on May 23, 1906, at 2:30 P. M. He died one of the wealthiest private citizens of Christiania because he was always careful in

1. Henrik Ibsen, Man and His Plays: Montrose J. Moses.
Page 160.

protecting his copyrights and administering his receipts. He died one of the most world-famous literary men; even the King of England sent an ambassador to be present at the burial, and he died with the name of "genius of the nineteenth century" clinging about him.

Henrik Ibsen appeals to the whole world as a dramatist; it was in this role of world dramatist that we studied him. A world-dramatist who was the child of the past, the companion of the present, and the progenitor of the future--- a trinity indissoluble.¹

We might easily take Mrs. Browning's lines to Euripides and apply them to Henrik Ibsen:

"And his touches of things common
Till they rose to touch the spheres."

1. European Dramatists: Archibald Henderson. Page 283.

protecting the copyrights and other interests of the author.
 It is one of the most serious threats to the literary world.
 The time of literary work is passing away so rapidly that
 the writer, who is tied with the "pen" to the "pen"
 and the "pen" to the "pen", is in a very bad way.

It is a very serious threat to the world of letters.
 It is a very serious threat to the world of letters.
 A world of letters is a world of letters. The world of letters
 is a world of letters. The world of letters is a world of letters.
 The world of letters is a world of letters. The world of letters
 is a world of letters. The world of letters is a world of letters.

It is a very serious threat to the world of letters.
 It is a very serious threat to the world of letters.
 The world of letters is a world of letters. The world of letters
 is a world of letters. The world of letters is a world of letters.
 The world of letters is a world of letters. The world of letters
 is a world of letters. The world of letters is a world of letters.

Bibliography

- Archer, William. Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen. (11 Vols.)
New York: Scribners. 1907.
- Boyesen, Hjalmar Hjorth. A Commentary on the Writings of Ibsen.
New York: Macmillan Company, 1894.
- Brandes, George. Henrik Ibsen, Critical Studies.
New York: Macmillan 1899.
- Brandes, George. Creative Spirits of the Nineteenth Century.
New York: Tyomas Y. Crowell Company
- Chandler, Frank W. Aspects of Modern Drama.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.
- Croce, Benedetto. European Literature in the Nineteenth Century.
New York: Alfred Knopf, 1925.

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911

1911



Davidoff, Henry.

Henrik Ibsen (in Living Dramatists)

pp 69-190

New York, 1905.

Dickenson, Thomas H.

An Outline of Contemporary Drama.

Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company,
1927.

Ellis, Henry Havelock.

The New Spirit.

London: G. Bell, 1890.

Franc, Miriam Alice.

Ibsen in England.

Boston: The Four Seas Company,
1919.

Gilliland, Mary S.

Ibsen's Women.

London: Reeves Company, 1894.

Gosse, Edmund.

Henrik Ibsen.

New York: Scribners' Sons, 1924.

Heller, Otto.

Henrik Ibsen: Plays & Problems.

Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Henderson, Archibald.

European Dramatists.

Cincinnati: Stenart & Kidd Company,
1913.

Historic House and Garden (Washington)

Charles, George

of 18-1900

May 1901, 1902

at the office of the architect

at the office of the architect

1901

For the artist

January 1, 1901, 1902

1901 is missing

January: The first year

1901

1901 is missing

January: The first year

1901 is missing

January: The first year

January: The first year

January: The first year

1901 is missing

January: The first year

1901

1901 is missing

1901 is missing

1901 is missing

1901 is missing

1901 is missing

1901 is missing

Horn, Frederick.

History of Literature of Scandinavian
North.

New York: Gregg's, 1895.

Huneker, James

Iconoclasts.

New York: Scribners' Sons, 1925.

Huneker, James.

Egoists. A Book of Supermen.

New York: Scribners' Sons, 1918.

Jaeger, Henrik.

The Life of Henrik Ibsen.

London: Heinemann, 1890.

Lee, Jeannette.

The Ibsen Secret.

New York: Putnam, 1907.

MacFall, Haldane.

Ibsen the Man. His Art & His
Significance.

New York: Richards Company, 1907.

Moses, Montrose, J.

The Man and His Plays.

New York: Nitchell Kennerley, 1908.

Roberts, Richard Ellis.

Henrik Ibsen: A Critical Study

London: Secker. 1912.

History of the Republic of the Philippines
Morris
New York: Macmillan, 1907.

1907, 1908.

Introduction.
New York: Macmillan, 1907.

History, 1907.

Introduction. 1. Book of the Republic.
New York: Macmillan, 1907.

History, 1907.

The Life of the Republic.
New York: Macmillan, 1907.

History, 1907.

The Republic of the Philippines.
New York: Macmillan, 1907.

History, 1907.

The Republic of the Philippines.
New York: Macmillan, 1907.

History, 1907.

The Republic of the Philippines.
New York: Macmillan, 1907.

History, 1907.

The Republic of the Philippines.
New York: Macmillan, 1907.

History, 1907.

Rose, Henry.

Henrik Ibsen: Poet, Mystic and
Moralist.

New York: Dodd, Mead & Company,
1913.

Russell, Sir Edward Richard.

Ibsen on His Merits.

Standing & Percy Cross.

London: Chapman & Hall. 1897.

Shaw, Bernard.

The Quintessence of Ibsenism.

New York: Brentano's. 1925.

Weigand, Hermann J.

The Modern Ibsen.

New York: Henry Holt. 1925.

Woolcott, Alexander.

Mrs. Fiske Her Views on Actors,
Acting, and the Problem of
Production.

New York: The Century Company, 1917.

Zanoni. (Pseud.)

Ibsen and the Drama.

London: Digby, Son & Company, 1894.

Zucker, A. E.

NEW BOOK

Ibsen: The Master Builder
Henry Holt.

New York: May 24, 1929.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

1955

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

1955

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

1955

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

1955

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

Periodicals.

Archer, William.

"Real Ibsen," INTERNATIONAL,
Feb. 1901, pp 182-201.

Brinton, C.

"Ecce Ibsen," CRITIC,
Mar. 1902, pp 236-249.

Curran, F.

"Review of Ibsen's Work,"
CATHOLIC WORLD.
September 1911, pp. 767-777.
October 1911, pp. 36-47.

Firkins, O. W.

"Hedda Gabler": Criticism."
REVIEW.
October 25, 1919. pp 525-526.

Firkins, O. W.

"When the Dead Awaken: Criticism."
REVIEW.
November 8, 1919, p. 563.

Halvorsen, J. B.

"Bibliographical Information
concerning Ibsen's Works." NATION.
Jan. 23, 1902. p. 73.

Henderson, Archibald.

"How Ibsen Made His Plays."

BOOKMAN.

July, 1910. pp 492-497.

Lawson, R.

"Ibsen the Individualist."

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

August 1913, pp 314-327.

Lie, R.

"Ibsen in Transformation."

LIVING AGE.

May 21, 1921. pp 451-453.

Orton, W. A.

"Ethics of Ibsen."

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEWS.

August 1910, pp. 163-170.

Payne, M.

"Estimate of Ibsen," OUTLOOK.

March 24, 1902. pp. 240-247.

Payne, M.

"When We Dead Awaken," (Review.)

NATION. Feb. 1 pp. 70-94.

Santum, B.

"Personal Recollections of Ibsen."

BOOKMAN, May 1913, pp 247-256.

Smith, W.

"Ibsen, Emerson & Neitzsche: The
Individualists."

POPULAR SCIENCE MONTHLY.

Feb. 1911, pp 147-157.

Stuart, R. M.

"Browsing About the Ibsen Country."

HARPERS, July 1911, pp 312-313.

Syford, E.

"Ibsen in America."

NEW ENGLAND MAGAZINE.

September 1912. pp 329-333.

Winter, Williams,

"Ibsenites and Ibsenism."

HARPERS.

May 21, 1910. p. 24.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
455 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
455 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
455 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
455 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

BOSTON UNIVERSITY



1 1719 02570 9884

